
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
00005391064

PLATE I. — THE FIELD OF THE CLOTH OF GOLD. (See p. 321, n. 3.) (From the painting in the Royal Collection at Hampton Court Palace; after Pollard, *Henry VIII*)

MEDIÆVAL AND MODERN HISTORY

BY

PHILIP VAN NESS MYERS

AUTHOR OF "A HISTORY OF GREECE," "ROME: ITS RISE AND FALL," "ANCIENT HISTORY," AND "A GENERAL HISTORY"

REVISED TO INCLUDE
THE WORLD WAR, 1914–1918

GINN AND COMPANY
BOSTON · NEW YORK · CHICAGO · LONDON
ATLANTA · DALLAS · COLUMBUS · SAN FRANCISCO

II 103
.M96
1919

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL

COPYRIGHT, 1885, 1905, 1919, BY
PHILIP VAN NESS MYERS

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

419.1

The Athenæum Press
GINN AND COMPANY · PROPRIETORS · BOSTON · U.S.A.

APR 24 1919

Cg. 7.R Agr. 26.19

The real history of the human race is the history of tendencies which are perceived by the mind, and not of events which are discovered by the senses. — BUCKLE.

Historical facts should not be a burden to the memory but an illumination of the soul. — LORD ACTON.

But history ought surely in some degree, if it is worth anything, to anticipate the lessons of time. We shall all no doubt be wise after the event; we study history that we may be wise before the event. — SEELEY.

PREFACE

The revised text of my *Mediæval and Modern History* has already appeared in a two-volume edition under the titles of *The Middle Ages* and *The Modern Age*. It is here presented, somewhat abridged, in a single illustrated book designed as a companion volume to my revised *Ancient History*.

The lists of books for further reading and study appended to the different chapters are in the main a selection from the fuller bibliographies of the earlier revised edition. The series of maps includes all the more important ones of that impression, besides fifteen new colored maps, eleven of which have been engraved expressly for the present work. The two entitled respectively "The Danelaw" and "Angevin Dominions" are taken by kind permission from Professor Edward P. Cheyney's *A Short History of England*, while "Europe after 1815" and "Europe at the Present Time" are through like courtesy drawn from Professor James Harvey Robinson's *An Introduction to the History of Western Europe*.

Since this volume, as already indicated, is practically only a slightly compressed edition of my *Middle Ages* and *The Modern Age*, it is fitting that I should here renew my expressions of gratitude to Professor George Lincoln Burr of Cornell University, Professor H. Morse Stephens of the University of California, and Professor George M. Dutcher of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut, for their scholarly and valuable assistance in the revision of the proofs of those texts.

I would further make grateful mention of my indebtedness to my friend, Mr. Dudley Emerson, for the kindly loan of photographs from his choice collection, and to my former pupil and assistant, Miss Mary Louise De Luce, for aid generously given me in the press of proof reading.

P. V. N. M.

College Hill, Ohio
February, 1905

CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS xii

LIST OF PLATES xv

LIST OF MAPS xv

CHAPTER

I. General Introduction: the Chief Factors in European Civilization 1

PART I — THE MIDDLE AGES

FIRST PERIOD — THE DARK AGES

(From the Fall of Rome to the Eleventh Century)

II. The Barbarian Kingdoms 7

III. The Church and its Institutions 14

I. The Conversion of the Barbarians 14

II. The Rise of Monasticism 22

III. The Rise of the Papacy 27

IV. The Fusion of Latin and Teuton 34

V. The Roman Empire in the East 42

VI. The Rise of Islam 46

VII. Charlemagne and the Restoration of the Empire in the West 61

VIII. The Northmen: the Coming of the Vikings 71

SECOND PERIOD — THE AGE OF REVIVAL

(From the Opening of the Eleventh Century to the Discovery of America by Columbus in 1492)

IX. Feudalism and Chivalry 77

I. Feudalism 77

II. Chivalry 93

Chapter		Page
X.	The Normans	101
	I. The Normans at Home and in Italy	101
	II. The Norman Conquest of England	103
XI.	The Papacy and the Empire	111
XII.	The Crusades (1096–1273)	121
	I. Preparation of Europe for the Crusades	121
	II. The First Crusade (1096–1099)	131
	III. The Second Crusade (1147–1149)	133
	IV. The Third Crusade (1189–1192)	135
	V. The Fourth Crusade (1202–1204)	136
	VI. The Children's Crusades; Minor Crusades	138
	VII. Crusades in Europe	141
	VIII. Influence upon European Civilization of the Crusades	143
XIII.	Supremacy of the Papacy; Decline of its Temporal Power	148
XIV.	The Mongols and the Ottoman Turks	159
	I. The Mongols	159
	II. The Ottoman Turks	164
XV.	The Growth of the Towns	169
XVI.	The Universities and the Schoolmen	187
XVII.	Growth of the Nations: Formation of National Governments and Literatures	198
	I. England	199
	II. France	220
	III. Spain	229
	IV. Germany	233
	V. Russia	242
	VI. Italy	244
	VII. The Northern Countries	249
XVIII.	The Renaissance	251
	I. The Beginnings of the Renaissance	251
	II. The Renaissance in Italy	255
	III. General Effects of the Renaissance	269

PART II — THE MODERN AGE

THIRD PERIOD — THE ERA OF THE REFORMATION

(From the Discovery of America, in 1492, to the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648)

Chapter		Page
XIX.	Geographical Discoveries and the Beginnings of Modern Colonization	275
XX.	The Beginnings of the Reformation	292
XXI.	The Ascendancy of Spain; her Relation to the Catholic Reaction	318
	I. Reign of the Emperor Charles V (1519–1556)	318
	II. Spain under Philip II (1556–1598)	326
XXII.	The Tudors and the English Reformation (1485–1603)	334
	I. Introductory	334
	II. The Reign of Henry VII (1485–1509)	335
	III. England severed from the Papacy by Henry VIII (1509–1547)	337
	IV. Changes in Creed and Ritual under Edward VI (1547–1553)	347
	V. Reaction under Mary (1553–1558)	349
	VI. Final Establishment of Protestantism under Elizabeth (1558–1603)	351
XXIII.	The Revolt of the Netherlands: Rise of the Dutch Republic (1572–1609)	363
XXIV.	The Huguenot Wars in France (1562–1629)	376
XXV.	The Thirty Years' War (1618–1648)	387

FOURTH PERIOD — THE ERA OF THE POLITICAL REVOLUTION

(From the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648, to the Twentieth Century)

I. THE AGE OF ABSOLUTE MONARCHY: THE PRELUDE TO THE POLITICAL REVOLUTION (1648–1789)

XXVI.	Introductory: the Doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings and the Maxims of the Enlightened Despots	396
XXVII.	The Ascendancy of France under Louis XIV (1643–1715)	403

CHAPTER PAGE

XXVIII. The Stuarts and the English Revolution (1603–1689) . 420
I. The First Two Stuarts 420
II. The Commonwealth and the Protectorate (1649–1660) 434
III. The Restored Stuarts 443
IV. Reign of William and Mary (1689–1702) . . . 450

XXIX. The Rise of Russia: Peter the Great (1682–1725) . . 454

XXX. The Rise of Prussia: Frederick the Great (1740–1786) . 469

XXXI. England in the Eighteenth Century 480
I. The Reign of Queen Anne (1702–1714) . . . 480
II. England under the Earlier Hanoverians . . . 484

XXXII. Austria under the Benevolent Despot, Emperor Joseph II (1780–1790) 497

II. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE NAPOLEONIC ERA (1789–1815)

XXXIII. The French Revolution (1789–1799) 500
I. Causes of the Revolution; the States-General of 1789 500
II. The National or Constituent Assembly (June 17, 1789–Sept. 30, 1791) 513
III. The Legislative Assembly (Oct. 1, 1791–Sept. 19, 1792) 519
IV. The National Convention (Sept. 20, 1792–Oct. 26, 1795) 523
V. The Directory (Oct. 27, 1795–Nov. 9, 1799) . . 536

XXXIV. The Consulate and the Napoleonic Empire (1799–1815) 543
I. The Consulate (1799–1804) 543
II. The Napoleonic Empire (1804–1815); the War of Liberation 551

III. THE RESTORATION OF 1815 AND THE DEMOCRATIC REACTION: THE SEQUEL TO THE REVOLUTION (1815–1904)

XXXV. The Congress of Vienna and Metternich 580

XXXVI. France since the Second Restoration (1815–1905) . . . 589

Chapter		Page
XXXVII.	England since the Battle of Waterloo (1815–1905)	599
	I. Progress towards Democracy	600
	II. Extension of the Principle of Religious Equality	605
	III. England's Relations with Ireland	609
XXXVIII.	Spain and the Revolt of her American Colonies	614
XXXIX.	The Liberation and Unification of Italy	619
XL.	The Making of the New German Empire	634
XLI.	Austria-Hungary after 1866	650
XLII.	Russia since the French Revolution	654
XLIII.	European Expansion in the Nineteenth Century	664
	I. Causes and General Phases of the Expansion Movement	664
	II. The Expansion of England	669
	III. The Expansion of France	678
	IV. The Expansion of Germany	680
	V. The Expansion of Russia	682
	VI. The Expansion of the United States	685
	VII. Situations and Problems created by the European Race Expansion	687
XLIV.	The World State	697
Conclusion — The New Age: Industrial Democracy		705
General Bibliography		709
Index and Pronouncing Vocabulary		725
Supplementary Chapter — The World War (1914–1918)		i

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Fig.		Page
1.	Tomb of Theodoric at Ravenna	8
2.	St. Martin's Church, Canterbury	16
3.	The Ruins of Iona	17
4.	The Ruins of Whitby	18
5.	The Ruins of the Church of St. Simeon Stylites, near Antioch, Syria	24
6.	The Simopetra Monastery of Mount Athos	25
7.	A Monk Copyist	26
8.	Trial by Combat	38
9.	Wager of Battle between a Man and Woman	39
10.	The Kaaba at Mecca	47
11.	The Mosque of Cordova	58
12.	A Viking Ship	72
13.	The Ceremony of Homage	82
14.	Typical Mediæval Castle	88
15.	Group in the Manor House	92
16.	Arming a Knight	95
17.	A Tilting Match between Two Knights	96
18.	Degradation of a Knight	97
19.	Landing in England of William of Normandy	101
20.	Battle of Hastings	104
21.	Domesday Book	107
22.	The Spiritual and the Temporal Power	112
23.	Investiture of a Bishop by a King	116
24.	Reception of Crusaders by the King of Hungary	128
25.	The Horses of St. Mark's	137
26.	A Mediæval Windmill	144
27.	Hut-Wagon of the Mediæval Tartars	160
28.	The Taj Mahal at Agra	163
29.	Ruins of the Great Mosque at Samarkand	168
30.	The Amphitheater at Arles in Mediæval Times	170
31.	A Count and his Wife granting a Charter to a City	171
32.	State Barge of Venice used in the Ceremony of "Wedding the Adriatic"	180
33.	A Canal in Venice	181

FIG. PAGE
34. The Cologne Cathedral 184
35. Town Hall of Louvain 185
36. University Audience in the Fifteenth Century 190
37. The Murder of Thomas Becket 201
38. Carnarvon Castle 205
39. Coronation Chair in Westminster Abbey 207
40. Charge of French Knights and Flight of English Arrows . . 213
41. Joan of Arc 214
42. Plowing Scene 218
43. In the Land of the Troubadours — the Castle of Foix 228
44. Recumbent Effigy of Queen Isabella 232
45. The Electors' Seat 236
46. Savonarola 248
47. Dante 253
48. Petrarch 257
49. A Block-Printed Page from the "Biblia Pauperum" 263
50. The Printing of Books 264
51. Case of Chained Books 265
52. Tomb at Tours of the Children of Charles VIII 267
53. A Chinese Magnet Figure 277
54. Christopher Columbus 279
55. "The Antipodes in Derision" 284
56. Erasmus 296
57. Martin Luther 302
58. John Calvin 309
59. Ignatius of Loyola 312
60. Emperor Charles V 318
61. Philip II 326
62. Henry VIII 339
63. Sir Thomas More 346
64. Queen Elizabeth 352
65. Mary Queen of Scots 355
66. Mary Stuart as Queen of France 355
67. Spanish and English War Vessels of the Sixteenth Century . . 358
68. Melrose Abbey 362
69. Typical Dutch Scene 363
70. William of Orange (The Silent) 367
71. Coat of Arms of William, Prince of Orange 375
72. Henry IV, King of France 381
73. Cardinal Richelieu 384
74. Gustavus Adolphus 389
75. Louis XIV 405
76. Duke of Marlborough 412

Fig.		Page
77.	View of Versailles	416
78.	Charles I	426
79.	Execution of the Earl of Strafford	429
80.	Westminster Hall	433
81.	Oliver Cromwell	438
82.	Charles II	445
83.	Peter the Great	456
84.	Catherine II of Russia	466
85.	Frederick the Great of Prussia	475
86.	John Wesley	488
87.	William Pitt, Earl of Chatham	489
88.	Voltaire	506
89.	Mirabeau	513
90.	The Lion of Lucerne	521
91.	The Guillotine	528
92.	Robespierre	532
93.	Napoleon Bonaparte	543
94.	William Pitt, Son of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham	555
95.	Baron vom Stein	572
96.	The Kremlin of Moscow	574
97.	Prince Metternich	585
98.	Napoleon III	593
99.	Queen Victoria as a Young Woman	599
100.	Lord Beaconsfield (Disraeli)	608
101.	William Ewart Gladstone	611
102.	Victor Emmanuel II	624
103.	Count Cavour	625
104.	Garibaldi	628
105.	Pope Pius X	631
106.	An Incident of the Franco-Prussian War: General Lapasset burning his Flags	645
107.	The Parliament Building at Budapest	651
108.	Henry M. Stanley	667
109.	The Imperial Regalia of Japan	688
110.	Field Marshal Oyama	694
111.	The Christ of the Andes	702

LIST OF PLATES

Plate		Facing Page
I.	The Field of the Cloth of Gold. (From the painting in the Royal Collection at Hampton Court Palace) *Frontispiece*	
II.	St. Mark's Square, Venice. (From a photograph)	148
III.	View of Florence, Italy, about the Year 1490. (From a contemporary woodcut)	182
IV.	Milan Cathedral. (From a photograph)	186
V.	Canterbury Cathedral. (From a photograph)	200
VI.	Ruins of Fountains Abbey, Yorkshire, England. (From a photograph)	344
VII.	Section of Old London Bridge. (From a contemporary drawing)	444

LIST OF MAPS

COLORED MAPS

Based in the main on Kiepert, Schrader, Droysen, Spruner-Sieglin, Poole, and Freeman. Many of the maps have been so modified by additions and omissions that as they here appear they are practically new charts.

	Facing Page
1. Europe in the Reign of Theodoric, about A.D. 500	8
2. Greatest Extent of the Saracen Dominions, about A.D. 750	52
3. Europe in the time of Charles the Great, A.D. 814	64
4. The Western Empire as divided at Verdun, A.D. 843	68
5. The Danelaw	74
6. Hitchin Manor, England, about 1816	84

	Facing Page
7. Europe and the Orient in 1096	132
8. Lands of the Holy Roman Empire under the Franconian Emperors, 1024–1125	152
9. Angevin Dominions	202
10. France about 1180	220
11. Spanish Kingdoms in 1360	230
12. Globe de Martin Behaim, 1492, and Globe Doré vers 1528	280
13. Explorations and Colonies of the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries	286
14. Europe at the Accession of the Emperor Charles V, 1519	320
15. Europe after the Peace of Westphalia, 1648	392
16. Central Europe in 1660	406
17. The Baltic Lands, about 1701	458
18. The Partition of Poland	466
19. Prussia under Frederick the Great, 1740–1786	472
20. Central Europe in 1780	498
21. Central Europe in 1801	546
22. Central Europe in 1810	568
23. Europe after 1815	582
24. Italy in 1859	626
25. Europe at the Present Time	646
26. Distribution of Races in Austria-Hungary	652
27. Southeastern Europe in 1914	658
28. The Partition of Africa	668
29. European Expansion	678
30. The Far East	688

SKETCH MAPS

	Page
1. Italy under the Lombards	11
2. The Roman Empire under Justinian	43
3. Discoveries of the Northmen	73
4. The Mongol Empire under Jenghis Khan and his Immediate Successors (thirteenth century)	161
5. The Empire of the Ottoman Turks about 1464	167
6. The Hansa Towns and their Chief Foreign Settlements	174
7. Russia and the Scandinavian Countries at the Close of the Middle Ages	243
8. Italy about the Middle of the Fifteenth Century	246
9. The Netherlands at the Truce of 1609	373

MEDIÆVAL AND MODERN HISTORY

CHAPTER I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION: THE CHIEF FACTORS IN EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION

1. Preliminary Survey. — In an earlier volume we sketched briefly the affairs of men from the time that they first emerged from the obscurity of the past to the break-up of the Roman Empire in the West.[1] In the present work we propose to continue the narrative there begun, and bring the story down to our own day.

The fourteen centuries of history embraced in our survey are usually conceived as forming two periods, — the *Middle Ages*, or the period lying between the fall of Rome and the discovery of America by Columbus in 1492, and the *Modern Age*, which extends from the latter event to the present time. The Middle Ages again naturally subdivide into two periods, — the *Dark Ages* and the *Age of Revival;* while the Modern Age, as we shall view it, also falls into two divisions, — the *Era of the Protestant Reformation* and the *Era of the Political Revolution.*

2. Chief Characteristics of the Four Periods. — The *Dark Ages*, which embrace the years between the fall of Rome and the opening of the eleventh century, are so called for the reason that the inrush of the barbarians and the almost total eclipse of the

[1] Our *Ancient History* practically ends with this great revolution of the fifth century of the Christian era, although in order to meet the requirements of some schools there is given in concluding chapters a brief résumé of events down to the Restoration of the Empire by Charlemagne, A.D. 800.

light of classical culture caused them to contrast unfavorably, in enlightenment and social order, as well with the age which preceded as with that which followed them. The period was one of origins, — of the beginnings of peoples, and languages, and institutions. During this time the Holy Roman Empire and the Papacy, institutions embodying two of the great ideals of the mediæval ages, grew into shape and form.

The *Age of Revival* begins with the opening of the eleventh century and ends with the discovery of the New World. During all this time civilization was making slow but sure advances; social order was gradually triumphing over feudal anarchy, and governments were becoming more regular. The last part of the period especially was marked by a great intellectual revival, — a movement known as the *Renaissance*, or "New Birth," — by improvements, inventions, and discoveries which greatly stirred men's minds and awakened them as from a sleep. The Crusades, or Holy Wars, were the most remarkable undertakings of the age.

The *Era of the Reformation* embraces the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth. The period is characterized by the great religious movement known as the Reformation, and the tremendous struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism. Almost all the wars of the period were religious wars. The last great combat was the Thirty Years' War in Germany, which was closed by the celebrated Peace of Westphalia, in 1648. After this date the disputes and wars between parties and nations were dynastic or political rather than religious in character.

The *Era of the Political Revolution* extends from the Peace of Westphalia to the present time. The age is especially characterized by the great conflict between despotic and liberal principles of government, resulting in the triumph of democratic ideas. During this period, in all the countries of Europe save Turkey and Russia, government by the people has taken the place of government by one or the few. This is one of the most important revolutions that history records. The central event of the epoch was the terrible upheaval of the French Revolution.

Having now made a general survey of the region we are to traverse, and having marked the three successive stages of the progressive course of European civilization, the intellectual, the religious, and the political revolution, we must turn back to our starting point, the fall of Rome.

3. **Relation to World History of the Fall of Rome.** — The calamity which in the fifth century befell the Roman Empire in the West is sometimes spoken of as an event marking the extinction of ancient civilization. The treasures of the Old World are represented as having been destroyed, and mankind as obliged to take a fresh start, — to lay the foundations of civilization anew. It was not so. All or almost all that was really valuable in the accumulations of antiquity escaped harm, and became sooner or later the possession of the succeeding ages. The catastrophe simply prepared the way for the shifting in the West of the scene of civilization from the south to the north of Europe, simply transferred at once political power, and gradually social and intellectual preëminence, from one race to another, — from the Roman to the Teuton.

The event was not an unrelieved calamity, because fortunately the floods that seemed to be sweeping so much away were not the mountain torrent, which covers fruitful fields with worthless drift, but the overflowing Nile with its rich deposits. Over all the regions covered by the barbarian inundation a new stratum of population was thrown down, a new soil formed that was capable of nourishing a better civilization than any the world had yet seen. Or, to use the figure of Draper, we may liken the precipitation of the northern barbarians upon the expiring Roman Empire to the heaping of fresh fuel upon a dying fire; for a time it burns lower, and seems almost extinguished, but soon it bursts through the added fuel, and flames up with redoubled energy and ardor.

4. **The Three Chief Elements of European Civilization.** — We must now notice what survived the catastrophe of the fifth century, what it was that Rome transmitted to the new Teutonic race. This renders necessary an analysis of the elements of civilization.

European civilization is mainly the result of the blending of three historic elements, — the *Classical*, the *Hebrew*, and the *Teutonic*.

By the classical element in civilization is meant that whole body of arts, sciences, literatures, laws, manners, ideas, social arrangements, and models of imperial and municipal government — everything, in a word, save Christianity — that Greece and Rome gave to mediæval and modern Europe. Taken together, these things constituted a valuable gift to the new northern race that was henceforth to represent civilization. It is true that the barbarian invaders of the Empire seemed at first utterly indifferent to these things; that the masterpieces of antique art were buried beneath the rubbish of sacked villas and cities; and that the precious manuscripts of the old sages and poets, because they were pagan productions and hence regarded as dangerous to Christian faith, were often suffered to lie neglected in the libraries of cathedrals and convents. Nevertheless, classical antiquity, as we shall learn, was the instructor of the Middle Ages.

By the Hebrew element in history is meant Christianity. This has been a most potent factor in modern civilization. It has so colored the life and so molded the institutions of the European peoples that their history is very largely a story of this religion, which, first going forth from Judea, was given to the younger world by the missionaries of Rome. Among the doctrines taught by the new religion were the unity of God, the brotherhood of man, and immortality, — doctrines which have greatly helped to make the modern so different from the ancient world.

By the Teutonic element in history is meant the barbarian peoples of Indo-European speech, the Goths, Franks, Danes, Angles, Saxons, and kindred tribes, who at the time of the break-up of the Roman Empire dwelt in central and northwestern Europe or had pushed into the Roman provinces and taken part in the overthrow of the Imperial Roman government. These folk had no arts or sciences or philosophies or literatures, but they and their later kin were destined to play a great part in the history of mediæval and modern times.

5. The Relative Importance in European History of the Classical, the Christian, and the Teutonic Element. — The question as to the influence which each of these great historical factors has exercised upon the development of European civilization is a very important one for the historical student, for the reason that his whole conception of history will be colored by the answer he gives to it. Gibbon, for instance, exalted the classical element and depreciated Christianity, representing this religion rather as a retarding than as a helpful force in the life of the European peoples. This misconception of the real place in history that Christianity actually holds is a chief fault of Gibbon's great work, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.*

On the other hand, some Church historians so represent history as to give Christianity credit for almost all the progress made by the European peoples since the advent of Christ. This is to undervalue the other historical factors.

Still others, again, represent the Teutonic race element as the chief force in modern civilization, and rest their hopes for the future of the world largely upon the Anglo-Saxon spirit of enterprise, freedom, and progress.

It is certain that we should allow the exclusive claims of none of these schools of interpreters of history. Modern civilization, as we have already intimated, is a very composite product. It has resulted from the mixing and mutual action and reaction upon one another of all the historical elements and agencies that we have mentioned — and many minor ones besides. Civilization cannot spare the treasures of Greek and Roman antiquity; it cannot spare the religious doctrines and moral precepts of the great Hebrew teachers; it cannot spare the earnest and masterful spirit of the Teutonic race. If any one of these elements were taken from modern civilization, it would be something wholly different from what it is.

6. Celts, Slavs, and Other Peoples. — Having noticed the Romans and the Teutons, the two most important of the peoples that present themselves to us at the time of the fall of Rome, if we now name the Celts, the Slavs, the Persians, the Arabians, and

the Mongols and Turks, we shall have under view the chief actors in the drama of mediæval and of a large part of modern history.

At the commencement of the mediæval era the Celts were in front of the Teutons, clinging to the western edge of the European continent, and engaged in a bitter contest with these latter peoples, which, in the antagonism of England and Ireland, was destined to extend itself to our own day.

The Slavs were in the rear of the Teutonic tribes, pressing them on even as the Celts in front were struggling to resist their advance. These peoples, backward in civilization, will play only an obscure part in the transactions of the mediæval era, but in the course of the modern period will assume a most commanding position among the European nations.

The Persians were in their old seats beyond the Euphrates, maintaining there what is called the New Persian Empire, the kings of which, until the rise of the Saracens in the seventh century, were the most formidable rivals of the emperors of Constantinople.

The Arabians were hidden in their deserts; but in the seventh century we shall see them, animated by a wonderful religious enthusiasm, issue from their peninsula and begin a contest with the Christian nations which, in its varying phases, was destined to fill a large part of the mediæval period.

The Mongols and Turks were buried in Central Asia. They will appear late in the eleventh century, proselytes for the most part of Mohammedanism; and, as the religious ardor of the Semitic Arabians grows cool, we shall see the Islam standard carried forward by these zealous converts of another race, and finally, in the fifteenth century, we shall see the Crescent, the adopted emblem of the new religion, placed by the Ottoman Turks upon the dome of St. Sophia in Constantinople.

As the Middle Ages draw to a close, the remote nations of Eastern Asia will gradually come within our circle of vision; and, as the Modern Age dawns, we shall catch a glimpse of new continents and strange races of men beyond the Atlantic.

PART I—THE MIDDLE AGES

FIRST PERIOD—THE DARK AGES

(From the Fall of Rome to the Eleventh Century)

CHAPTER II

THE BARBARIAN KINGDOMS

7. Introductory. — In one of the concluding chapters of our *Ancient History*, as a part of the story of the break-up of the Roman Empire in the West, we gave some account of the migrations and settlements of the Teutonic tribes. In the present chapter we shall indicate briefly the political fortunes, for the two centuries and more following the fall of Rome, of the principal kingdoms set up by the Teutonic chieftains in the different parts of the old Empire.

8. Kingdom of the Ostrogoths (A.D. 493–553). — Odoacer will be recalled as the barbarian chief who dethroned the last of the Western Roman emperors.[1] His feeble government in Italy lasted only seventeen years, when it was brought to an end by the invasion of the Ostrogoths (Eastern Goths) under Theodoric, the greatest of their chiefs, who set up in Italy a new dominion known as the Kingdom of the Ostrogoths.

The reign of Theodoric covered thirty-three years (A.D. 493–526), — years of such quiet and prosperity as Italy had not known since the happy era of the Antonines. The king made good his promise that his reign should be such that "the only regret

[1] See *Ancient History*, sec. 560.

of the people should be that the Goths had not come at an earlier period." [2]

Notwithstanding his generally humane and tolerant disposition, Theodoric stained the last years of his reign by various acts of cruelty and persecution. Among the victims of his injustice was the renowned Boethius, one of the most distinguished scholars of that time, who was put to death on what seems to have been an unfounded charge of disloyalty. During the months of imprisonment which preceded his execution, Boethius wrote his *Philosophiæ Consolatio*, or "Consolation of Philosophy," a work that possessed a most remarkable attraction for a certain class of minds throughout the Middle Ages.



FIG. 1. — TOMB OF THEODORIC AT RAVENNA
(From a photograph)

The kingdom established by the rare abilities of Theodoric lasted only twenty-seven years after his death. It was destroyed by the generals of Justinian, Emperor of the East (sec. 50); and Italy, freed from the barbarians, was for a time reunited to the Empire (A.D. 553).

9. **Kingdom of the Visigoths** (A.D. 415–711). — The Visigoths (Western Goths) were already in possession of Southern Gaul and the greater part of Spain when the line of Western Roman emperors was brought to an end by the act of Odoacer and his companions. Driven south of the Pyrenees by the kings of the Franks, they held their possessions in Spain until the beginning of the eighth century, when their rule was brought to an end by

[2] Theodoric's chief minister and adviser was Cassiodorus, a statesman and writer of Roman birth, whose constant but unfortunately vain effort was to effect a union of the conquerors and the conquered, and thus to establish in Italy a strong and permanent Romano-Gothic state under the rule of the royal house of the Ostrogoths.


EUROPE
IN THE REIGN OF
THEODORIC
About A. D. 500
Roman Empire
Celts
Teutonic Settlements
Eboracum (York)
Londinium (London)
Saxons
Angles
Jutes
SCOTS
PICTS
THANET
Rhine R.
Saxons
Cologne
Trier
Mainz
Thuringia
Elbe R.
Danube
Pannonia
FRANKISH KINGDOM
Paris
Chalons
Metz
Orleans
Tours
Alemanni
BURGUNDIAN KINGDOM
Lyons
Geneva
Milan
Ravenna
Nice
Arles
Bordeaux
Toulouse
Narbonne
SUEVIAN KINGDOM
VISIGOTHIC KINGDOM
Ebro R.
Barcelona
Tagus R.
Toledo
Guadiana R.
Cordova
Guadalquivir R.
WEST GOTHIC KINGDOM
BALEARIC IS.
CORSICA
ROME
Naples
SARDINIA
VANDAL KINGDOM
Carthage
Str. of Gibraltar
35
30
25
50
45
40
25
20
15
10
5
0
5
10
15


20
25
30
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
60
55
50
45
40
35
30
25
Huns
Gepidæ
Cherson
THRACE
MACEDONIA
Constantinople
PONTUS
Trapezus
(Trebizond)
Theodosiopolis
Nicæa
Persarmenia
Thebarmes
Melitene
Amida
Nisibis
Nineveh
PERSIAN
KINGDOM
ASIA
Antioch
Ctesiphon
CRETE
Alexandria
Ælia
Ghassanides
Saracens
EGYPT
Medina
Mecca

the Saracens (sec. 65). The Visigothic kingdom when thus overturned had lasted nearly three hundred years. During this time the conquerors had mingled with the old Romanized inhabitants of Spain, so that in the veins of the Spaniard of to-day is blended the blood of Iberian, Celt, Roman, and Teuton, together with that of the last intruder, the African Moor.

10. **Kingdom of the Burgundians** (A.D. 443–534). — Towards the middle of the fifth century the Burgundians acquired a permanent settlement in Southeastern Gaul. A portion of their ancient dominion still retains from them the name of "Burgundy." The Burgundians had barely secured a foothold in Gaul before they came in collision with the Franks on the north, and were reduced by them to a state of dependence.

11. **Kingdom of the Vandals** (A.D. 439–533). — About half a century before the fall of Rome the Vandals set up a kingdom in North Africa. These barbarians were animated by a more destructive energy than any other of the Germanic tribes that took part in the subversion of the Roman Empire. Their very name has passed into all languages as the synonym of wanton destruction and violence.

Being Arian[3] Christians, the Vandals persecuted with furious zeal the orthodox party, the followers of Athanasius. Moved by the entreaties of the African Catholics, the Eastern Emperor Justinian sent his general Belisarius to drive the barbarians from Africa. The expedition was successful, and Carthage and the fruitful fields of Africa were restored to the Empire after having suffered the insolence of the barbarian conquerors for the space of above a hundred years. The Vandals remaining in the country were gradually absorbed by the old Roman population, and after a few generations no certain trace of the barbarian invaders could be detected in the physical appearance, the language, or the customs of the inhabitants of the African coast. The Vandal nation had disappeared; the name alone remained.

12. **The Franks under the Merovingians** (A.D. 486–752). — The Franks, who were destined to give a new name to Gaul

[3] See *Ancient History*, sec. 537.

and form the nucleus of the French nation, made their first settlements west of the Rhine about two hundred years before the fall of Rome. Among their several chieftains at the time of this event was Clovis. Upon the break-up of the Roman Empire in the West, Clovis conceived the ambition of erecting a kingdom upon the ruins of the Roman power. He attacked Syagrius, the Roman governor of Gaul, and at Soissons gained a decisive victory over his forces (A.D. 486). Thus was destroyed forever in Gaul that Roman authority established among its tribes more than five centuries before by the conquests of Julius Cæsar.

Clovis in a short time extended his authority over the greater part of Gaul, reducing to the condition of tributaries the various Teutonic tribes that had taken possession of different portions of the country. Upon his death (A.D. 511) his extensive dominions, in accordance with the ancient Teutonic law of inheritance, were divided among his four sons. About a century and a half of discord followed, by the end of which time the Merovingians[4] had become so feeble and inefficient that they were contemptuously called *rois fainéants*, or "do-nothing kings," and an ambitious officer of the crown known as Mayor of the Palace, in a way that will be explained a little later (sec. 72), pushed aside the weak Merovingian king and gave to the Frankish monarchy a new royal line, — the Carolingian.

13. **Kingdom of the Lombards** (A.D. 568–774). — Barely a decade had passed after the recovery of Italy from the Ostrogoths by the Eastern Emperor Justinian (sec. 8), before a large part of the peninsula was again lost to the Empire through its conquest by another barbarian tribe known as the Lombards.[5] When they entered Italy the Lombards were Christians of the

[4] So called from Merowig, an early chieftain of the race.

[5] The Lombards were, after the Vandals, the most untamed of all the tribes that fell upon the Roman provinces, and their conquests were attended with the most appalling slaughters and cruelties. The story of Alboin and Rosamund is a typical one. Alboin had slain in battle a rival chieftain, the king of the Gepidæ, whose beautiful daughter, Rosamund, he had just taken as a bride. At a banquet in celebration of his victories he forced his young queen to drink wine from her father's skull, which he had had made into a drinking cup. In revenge for the insult, Rosamund plotted the death of her husband and then married the murderer.

Arian sect; but in time they became converts to the orthodox faith, and Pope Gregory I bestowed upon their king a diadem which came to be known as the "Iron Crown," for the reason that there was wrought into it what was believed to be one of the nails of the cross upon which Christ had suffered.

The Kingdom of the Lombards was destroyed by Charlemagne, the most noted of the Frankish rulers, in the year 774; but the blood of the invaders had by this time become intermingled with that of the former subjects of the Empire, so that throughout all that part of the peninsula which is still called Lombardy after them, one will to-day occasionally see the fair hair and light complexion which reveal the strain of German blood in the veins of the present inhabitants.

MAP OF ITALY UNDER THE LOMBARDS

Showing how the political unity of the peninsula was shattered by the Lombard conquest. The unshaded portions represent the regions taken possession of by the barbarians; the shaded areas indicate the lands which remained in the hands of the Eastern Emperor

One important result of the Lombard conquest of Italy was the destruction of the political unity established by the Romans and the breaking up of the country into a multitude of petty states. This resulted from the incomplete nature of the conquest and from the loose feudal constitution of the Lombard monarchy, which was rather a group of practically independent duchies than a real kingdom. Not until our own day did there emerge from this political chaos a united Italy.

14. **The Anglo-Saxon Conquest of Britain.** — In the fifth century of our era, being then engaged in her death struggle with the barbarians, Rome withdrew her legions from Britain in order to protect Italy. Thus that province was left exposed to the depredations of the Anglo-Saxon corsairs from the Continent. No other province of the Roman Empire made such determined and heroic resistance against the barbarians. It is to this period of desperate struggle that the famous King Arthur belongs. The legends that have gathered about the name of this national hero are mostly mythical; yet it is possible that he had a real existence and that the name represents one or more of the most valiant of the Celtic chiefs who battled so long and heroically against the pagan invaders.[6]

The conquerors of Britain belonged to three Teutonic tribes, — the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, — but among the Celts they all passed under the name of Saxons, and among themselves, after they began to draw together into a single nation, under that of Angles, whence the name England (Angle-land).

By the close of the sixth century the invading bands had set up in the conquered parts of the island eight or nine, or perhaps more, kingdoms, — frequently designated, though somewhat inaccurately, as the *Heptarchy*. For the space of two hundred years there was an almost perpetual strife for supremacy among the leading states. Finally, Egbert, king of Wessex (A.D. 802–839), brought all the other kingdoms to a subject or tributary condition, and became in reality, though he seems never, save on one occasion, to have actually assumed the title, the first king of England.

15. **Teutonic Tribes outside the Empire.** — We have now spoken of the most important of the Teutonic tribes which forced themselves within the limits of the Roman Empire in the West, and that there, upon the ruins of the civilization they had overthrown, laid or helped to lay the foundations of the modern nations of Italy, Spain, France, and England. Beyond the boundaries of the old

[6] Many of the hard-pressed Britons fled across the English Channel to the adjacent shores of France, and gave name to the French province of Brittany.

Empire were still other tribes and clans of this same mighty family of nations, — tribes and clans that were destined to play great parts in European history.

On the east, beyond the Rhine, were the ancestors of the modern Germans. Notwithstanding the immense hosts that the forests and morasses of Germany had poured into the Roman provinces, the fatherland, in the sixth century of our era, seemed still as crowded as before the great migration began. These tribes were yet barbarians in manners, and, for the most part, pagans in religion. In the northwest of Europe were the Scandinavians, the ancestors of the modern Danes, Swedes, and Norwegians. They were as yet untouched either by the civilization or the religion of Rome.

Selections from the Sources.[7] — *The Letters of Cassiodorus* (trans. by Thomas Hodgkin). Read bk. i, letters 24 and 35; bk. ii, letters 32 and 34; bk. iii, letters 17, 19, 29, 31, and 43; bk. xi, letters 12 and 13; bk. xii, letter 20. These letters are invaluable in showing what was the general condition of things in the transition period between ancient and mediæval times. BOETHIUS, *Consolation of Philosophy* (Bohn). "Whoso would understand," says Hodgkin, "the thoughts that were working in the noblest minds of the mediæval Europe would do well to give a few hours' study to the once world-renowned 'Consolation of Philosophy.'" COLBY, *Selections*, Extract 5, "The Coming of the English to Britain."

Secondary Works. — HODGKIN, *Italy and her Invaders* and *Theodoric the Goth*. Hodgkin is recognized as the best authority on the period of the migration. VILLARI, *The Barbarian Invasions of Italy*. GUMMERE, *Germanic Origins;* an authoritative and interesting work on the early culture of the Germans. GIBBON, *The Decline and Fall*, chaps. xxxviii and xxxix. EMERTON, *An Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages*, chaps. vi and vii. BÉMONT and MONOD, *Mediæval Europe*, chaps. iv–vii. MUNRO and SELLERY, *Mediæval Civilization*, pp. 44–59. This book consists of selections from modern authors, translated and adapted to school use by the editors.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Boethius and his *Consolation of Philosophy*. 2. Manners and customs of the early Germans. 3. Cassiodorus. 4. The character of Clovis. 5. "The groans of the Britons."

[7] For full names of authors and for further information concerning works cited, see General Bibliography at end of book.

CHAPTER III

THE CHURCH AND ITS INSTITUTIONS

I. The Conversion of the Barbarians

16. Introductory. — The most important event in the history of the tribes that took possession of the Roman Empire in the West was their conversion to Christianity. Many of the barbarians were converted before or soon after their entrance into the Empire; to this circumstance the Roman provinces owed their immunity from the excessive cruelties which pagan barbarians seldom fail to inflict upon a subjected enemy. Alaric left untouched the treasures of the churches of the Roman Christians because his own faith was also Christian. For like reason the Vandal king Geiseric yielded to the prayers of Pope Leo the Great and promised to leave to the inhabitants of the imperial city their lives.[1] The more tolerable fate of Italy, Spain, and Gaul, as compared with the hard fate of Britain, is owing, in part at least, to the fact that the tribes which overran those countries had become in the main converts to Christianity before they crossed the boundaries of the Empire, while the Saxons when they entered Britain were still untamed pagans.

17. Conversion of the Goths, Vandals, and Other Tribes. — The first converts to Christianity among the barbarians beyond the limits of the Empire were won from among the Goths. Foremost of the apostles that arose among them was Ulfilas, who translated the Scriptures into the Gothic language, omitting from his version, however, the Books of the Kings, as he feared that the stirring recital of wars and battles in that portion of the Word might kindle into too fierce a flame the martial ardor of his new converts.

[1] See *Ancient History*, secs. 553 and 559.

What happened in the case of the Goths happened also in the case of most of the barbarian tribes that participated in the overthrow of the Roman Empire in the West. By the time of the fall of Rome the Goths, the Vandals, the Suevi, and the Burgundians had become proselytes to Christianity. They, however, professed the Arian creed, which had been condemned by the great council of the Church held at Nicæa during the reign of Constantine the Great. Hence they were regarded as heretics by the Catholic Church, and all had to be reconverted to the orthodox creed, which good work was gradually accomplished.

The remaining Teutonic tribes of whose conversion we shall speak — the Franks, the Anglo-Saxons, and the chief tribes of Germany — embraced at the outset the Catholic faith.

18. Conversion of the Franks; Importance of this Event. — The Franks when they entered the Empire, like the Angles and Saxons when they landed in Britain, were still pagans. Christianity gained way very slowly among them until a supposed interposition by the Christian God in their behalf led the king and nation to adopt the new religion in place of their old faith. The circumstances, as reported by tradition, were these. In a terrible battle between the Alemanni and the Franks under their king Clovis, the situation of the Franks had become desperate. Then Clovis, falling upon his knees, called upon the God of the Christians, and vowed that if he would give him the victory he would become his follower. The battle turned in favor of the Franks, and Clovis, faithful to his vow, was baptized, and with him three thousand of his warriors.

This story of the conversion of Clovis and his Franks illustrates how the belief of the barbarians in omens and divine interpositions, and particularly their feeling that if their gods did not do for them all they wanted done they had a right to set them aside and choose others in their stead, contributed to their conversion, and how the reception of the new faith was often a tribal or national affair rather than a matter of personal conviction.

"The conversion of the Franks," says the historian Milman, "was the most important event in its remote as well as its immediate consequences in European history." It was of such

moment for the reason that the Franks embraced the orthodox Catholic faith, while almost all the other German invaders of the Empire had embraced the heretical Arian creed. This secured them the loyalty of their Roman subjects and also gained for them the official favor of the Church of Rome. Thus was laid the basis of the ascendancy in the West of the Frankish kings.

19. Augustine's Mission to England. — In the year A.D. 596 Pope Gregory I sent the monk Augustine with a band of forty companions to teach the Christian faith in Britain, in whose people he had become interested through seeing in the slave market at Rome some fair-faced captives from that remote region.

FIG. 2.—ST. MARTIN'S CHURCH, CANTERBURY
(From a photograph)

This church occupies the site of a chapel built in the Roman period and standing at the time of the landing of the monk Augustine, in the year 597. Its walls show some of the Roman bricks of the original church

The monks were favorably received by the English, who listened attentively to the story the strangers had come to tell them; and being persuaded that the tidings were true, they burned the temples of Woden and Thor, and were in large numbers baptized in the Christian faith.

One of the most important consequences of the conversion of Britain was the reëstablishment of that connection of the island with Roman civilization which had been severed by the calamities of the fifth century. As Green says, — he is speaking of the embassy of St. Augustine, — "The march of the monks as they chanted their solemn litany was in one sense a return of the Roman legions who withdrew at the trumpet call of Alaric. . . . Practically Augustine's landing renewed that union with the western world which the landing of Hengist had destroyed. The new England was admitted into the older commonwealth of nations.

The civilization, art, letters, which had fled before the sword of the English conquerors, returned with the Christian faith."

20. The Conversion of Ireland; Iona. — The spiritual conquest of Ireland was effected largely by a zealous priest named Patricius (d. about A.D. 469), better known as St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland. With such success were his labors attended that by the time of his death a great part of the island had embraced the Christian faith.

Never did any race receive the Gospel with more ardent enthusiasm. The Irish or Celtic Church sent out its devoted missionaries into the Pictish highlands, into the forests of Germany, and among the wilds of Alps and Apennines.[2] Among the numerous religious houses founded by the Celtic missionaries was the famous monastery established A.D. 563 by the Irish monk St. Columba, on the little isle of Iona, just off the Pictish coast. Iona became a most renowned center of Christian learning and missionary zeal, and for almost two centuries was the point from which radiated light through the darkness of the surrounding heathenism. Fitly has it been called the Nursery of Saints and the Oracle of the West.[3]



FIG. 3. — THE RUINS OF IONA. (After an old drawing)

"That man is little to be envied whose patriotism would not gain force upon the plain of Marathon, or whose piety would not grow warmer among the ruins of Iona." — DR. JOHNSON, *A Journey to the Western Isles of Scotland*

[2] These Irish missionaries were not merely the representatives of Christianity; their time and strength were devoted to many purely secular duties. "They were instructors in every known branch of science and learning of the time, possessors and bearers of a higher culture than was at that period to be found anywhere on the Continent, and can surely claim to have been the pioneers, — to have laid the corner stone of western culture on the Continent." — ZIMMER, *The Irish Element in Mediæval Culture*, p. 130.

[3] In Southern Germany (now Switzerland) the Irish monk Gallus established (A.D. 613) the celebrated monastery of St. Gall, which at a later time became one of the chief seats of learning in Central Europe.

21. Rivalry between the Roman and the Celtic Church; The Council of Whitby (A.D. 664). — From the very moment that Augustine touched the shores of Britain and summoned the Welsh clergy to acknowledge the discipline of the Roman Church, there had been a growing jealousy between the Latin and Celtic churches, which had now risen into the bitterest rivalry and strife. So long had the Celtic Church been cut off from all relations with Rome, that it had come to differ somewhat from it in the matter of certain ceremonies and observances, such as the time of keeping Easter and the form of the tonsure.[4]

With a view to settling the quarrel, Oswy, king of Northumbria, who thought that "as they all expected the same kingdom of



FIG. 4. — THE RUINS OF WHITBY. (From a photograph by the author)

heaven, so they ought not to differ in the celebration of the divine mysteries," called a synod composed of representatives of both parties, at the monastery of Whitby. The chief question of debate, which was argued before the king by the ablest advocates of both churches, was the proper time for the observance of Easter. The debate was warm, and hot words were exchanged. Finally, Wilfrid, the speaker for the Roman party, happening to quote the words of Christ to Peter, "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," the king asked the Celtic monks if these words were really spoken by Christ to that apostle, and upon their admitting that they were, Oswy said: "He being the

[4] In the Roman tonsure the top of the head was shaven, in the Celtic the front part only.

doorkeeper, . . . I will in all things obey his decrees, lest when I come to the gates of the kingdom of heaven, there should be none to open them."

The decision of the prudent Oswy gave the British Isles to Rome; for not only was all England soon won to the Roman side, but the churches and monasteries of Wales and Ireland and Scotland came in time to conform to the Roman standard and custom. "By the assistance of our Lord," says the pious Latin chronicler, "the monks were brought to the canonical observation of Easter and the right mode of the tonsure."

One important result of the Roman victory was the hastening of the political unity of England through its ecclesiastical unity. The Celtic Church, in marked contrast with the Latin, was utterly devoid of capacity for organization. It could have done nothing in the way of developing among the several Anglo-Saxon states the sentiment of nationality. On the other hand, the Roman Church, through the exercise of a central authority, through national synods and general legislation, overcame the isolation of the different kingdoms and helped powerfully to draw them together into a common political life.

22. Pagan and Christian Literature of the Anglo-Saxons. — A strong side light is cast upon our ancestors' change of religion by two famous poems which date from the Anglo-Saxon period of our literature. One of these, called *Beowulf*, was composed while our forefathers were yet pagans, and probably before they left the Continent; the other, known as the *Paraphrase of the Scriptures*, was written soon after their conversion to Christianity.

Beowulf is an epic poem which tells of the exploits of an heroic Viking, Beowulf by name, who delivers the people from a terrible monster that feasted upon sleeping men. It is alive with the instincts of paganism, and is a faithful reflection of the rough heathen times in which it had birth. Every passage displays the love of the savage for coarse horrors and brutal slaughters. Thus it runs: "The wretched wight seized quickly a sleeping warrior, slit him unawares, bit his bone-locker, drank his blood, in morsels swallowed him; soon had he all eaten, feet

and fingers." Before another can be made a victim Beowulf closes with the monster. "The hall thundered, the ale of all the Danes and earls was spilt. Angry, fierce were the strong fighters, the hall was full of din. It was great wonder that the wine-hall stood above the warlike beasts, that the fair earth-house fell not to the ground." Such was the gleeman's song which delighted our Saxon forefathers as they drank and caroused in their great mead halls.

In striking contrast with the pagan hero poem stands the *Pharaphrase*, the first fruits in English literature of the mission of Augustine. This consists of Bible stories retold in verse. These metrical paraphrases, it is now believed, were composed, in the main, between the seventh and the tenth century by different poets, who seem to have been disciples or imitators of a certain monk of Whitby, named Cædmon, upon whom, according to a beautiful legend transmitted to us by the Venerable Bede,[5] the gift of song had been miraculously bestowed, and who, though he could neither read nor write, turned into sweet verses, as they were recited to him, many of the graphic tales of Holy Writ. In these compositions is reflected in a wonderful manner the revolution in thought and feeling and in aim and purpose of life which the reception of Christian teachings and doctrines, in place of their earlier beliefs and ideas, wrought in the pagan conquerors of Britain.

23. The Conversion of Germany. — The conversion of the tribes of Germany was effected by Celtic, Anglo-Saxon, and Frankish missionaries, and the sword of Charlemagne (sec. 74). The great apostle of Germany was the Saxon Winfrid, better known as St. Boniface. During a long and intensely active life he founded schools and monasteries, organized churches, preached and baptized, and at last died a martyr's death (A.D. 753). Through

[5] Bede the Venerable (about A.D. 673–735) was a pious and learned Northumbrian monk, who wrote, among other works, an invaluable one entitled *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, "The Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation." The work recites, as its central theme, the story of how our forefathers were won to the Christian faith. We are indebted to Bede for a large part of our knowledge of early England.

him, as says Milman, the Saxon invasion of England flowed back upon the Continent.

The Christianizing of the tribes of Germany relieved the Teutonic folk of Western Europe from the constant peril of massacre by their heathen kinsmen, and erected a strong barrier in Central Europe against the advance of the waves of Turanian paganism and Mohammedanism which for centuries beat so threateningly against the eastern frontiers of Germany.

24. **The Conversion of Russia.** — Vladimir the Great (d. 1015) was the Clovis of Russia. This ruler, according to the account of the matter that has come down to us, having had urged upon his attention the claims of different religions, sent out envoys to make investigation respecting the relative merits of Mohammedanism, the Jewish religion, and Latin and Greek Christianity. The commissioners reported in favor of the religion of Constantinople, having been brought to this mind by what seemed to them the supernatural splendors of the ceremonials that they had witnessed in the great Church of St. Sophia.

Vladimir caused the great wooden idol of the chief god of his people to be hurled into the Dnieper, and his subjects to be baptized in its waters by the Christian priests. This act of Vladimir marks the real beginning of the evangelization of Russia (988).

That the Slavic tribes should have come under the religious influence of Constantinople instead of under that of Rome had far-reaching consequences for Russian history. This circumstance cut off Russia from sympathy with the Catholic West and shut her out from all the civilizing influences that accompanied Latin Christianity.

25. **Christianity in the North.** — The progress of Christianity in the North was slow; but gradually, during the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, the missionaries of the Church won over all the Scandinavian peoples. One important effect of their conversion was the checking of those piratical expeditions which during all the centuries of their pagan history had been constantly putting out from the fiords of the Northern peninsulas and vexing every shore to the south.

By about the year 1000 all Europe was claimed by Christianity, save the regions of the Northwest about the Baltic, which were inhabited chiefly by the still pagan Finns and Lapps, parts of what is now Russia, and the larger portion of the Iberian peninsula, which was in the hands of the Mohammedan Moors.

26. Reaction of Paganism on Christianity. — Thus were the conquerors of the Empire met and conquered by Christianity. The victory, it must be confessed, was in a great degree a victory rather in name than in fact. The Church could not all at once leaven the great mass of heathenism which had so suddenly been brought within its pale. For a long time after they were called Christians, the barbarians, coarse and cruel and self-willed and superstitious as they were, understood very little of the doctrines and exhibited still less of the true spirit of the religion they professed. To this depressing reaction of Teutonic barbarism upon the Church is without doubt to be attributed in large measure the deplorable moral state of Europe during so large a part of the mediæval ages.

II. The Rise of Monasticism

27. Monasticism defined; the System fostered by Scripture Teachings. — It was during the period between the third and the sixth century that there grew up in the Church the institution known as Monasticism. This was so remarkable a system, and one that exerted so profound an influence upon mediæval and even later history, that we must here acquaint ourselves with at least its spirit and aims.

The term Monasticism, in its widest application, denotes a life of austere self-denial and of seclusion from the world, with the object of promoting the interests of the soul. As thus defined, the system embraced two prominent classes of ascetics: (1) hermits, or anchorites, — persons who, retiring from the world, lived solitary lives in desolate places; (2) cenobites, or monks, who formed communities and lived usually under a common roof.

Christian asceticism[6] was fostered by teachings drawn from various texts of the Bible. Thus the apostle St. Paul had said, "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord; . . . but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world."[7] And Christ himself had declared, "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple";[8] and, again, he had said to the rich young man, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor."[9] These passages, and others like them, taken literally, tended greatly to confirm the belief of the ascetic that his life of isolation and poverty and abstinence was the most perfect life and the surest way to win salvation.

28. St. Antony, "the Father of the Hermits." — St. Antony, an Egyptian ascetic (b. about A.D. 251), who by his example and influence gave a tremendous impulse to the movement, is called the "Father of the Hermits." The romance of his life, written by the celebrated Athanasius, stirred the whole Christian world and led thousands to renounce society and in imitation of the saint to flee to the desert. It is estimated that before the close of the fourth century the population of the desert in many districts in Egypt was equal to that of the cities.

Most renowned of all the anchorites of the East was St. Simeon Stylites, the Saint of the Pillar (d. A.D. 459), who spent thirty-six years on a column only three feet in diameter at the top, which he had gradually raised to a height of over fifty feet.[10]

29. Monasticism in the West. — During the fourth century the anchorite type of asceticism, which was favored by the mild climate of the Eastern lands and especially by that of Egypt, assumed in some degree the monastic form; that is to say, the fame of this or that anchorite or hermit drew about him a number

[6] The ascetic idea of life was by no means original with Christianity. Brahmanism has always had its ascetics and hermits. All Buddhistic lands are to-day filled with monasteries and monks. About the time of Christ there were to be found in Syria among the Jews the Essenes, a sect of religious enthusiasts whose members led a solitary and ascetic life.

[7] 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33. [8] Luke xiv. 26.

[9] Matt. xix. 21. [10] Read Tennyson's poem, "St. Simeon Stylites."

of disciples, whose rude huts or cells formed what was known as a *laura*, the nucleus of a monastery.

Soon after the cenobite system had been established in the East it was introduced into Europe, and in an astonishingly short space of time spread throughout all the Western countries where Christianity had gained a foothold. Here it prevailed to the almost total exclusion of the hermit mode of life. Monasteries arose on

FIG. 5. — RUINS OF THE CHURCH OF ST. SIMEON STYLITES, NEAR ANTIOCH, SYRIA. (From Part II of the Publications of the American Archæological Expedition to Syria in 1899–1900)

This church was erected, a few years after Simeon's death, around the pillar (the base of which is to be seen in the cut) upon which the saint had passed so many years. It became one of the most popular of the mediæval pilgrim shrines

every side. The number that fled to these retreats was vastly augmented by the disorder and terror attending the invasion of the barbarians and the overthrow of the Empire in the West.

30. **The Rule of St. Benedict.** — With the view to introducing some sort of regularity into the practices and austerities of the monks, rules were early prescribed for their observance. The three essential requirements or vows of the monk were poverty, chastity, and obedience.

The greatest legislator of the monks was St. Benedict of Nursia (A.D. 480–543), the founder of the celebrated monastery of Monte

Cassino, situated midway between Rome and Naples in Italy. His code was to the religious world what the *Corpus Juris Civilis* of Justinian (sec. 50) was to the lay society of Europe. Many of his rules were most wise and practical, as, for instance, one that made manual work a pious duty, and another that required the monk to spend an allotted time each day in sacred reading.

The monks who subjected themselves to the rule of St. Benedict were known as Benedictines. The order became immensely popular. At one time it embraced about forty thousand abbeys.



FIG. 6. — THE SIMOPETRA MONASTERY OF MOUNT ATHOS. (From a photograph)

"The convents of Mt. Athos in their present state give us a very accurate notion of the great monasteries of Europe, at the close of the twelfth century." — SABATIER, *Life of St. Francis of Assisi*

31. Monastic Reforms; Cluny. — Monasticism as an active and potent force in the history of the West has a long and wonderful history of more than a thousand years. This history presents one dominant fact, — ever-renewed reform movements in the monasteries. Scarcely was a monastery or a monastic order established before the acquisition of wealth brought in self-indulgence and laxity of discipline. But there was always among the backsliding dwellers in the cloisters a "saving remnant," and upon these choice souls the spirit of reform was sure to descend, and thus it happens that with the reform movements marking the history of the monks are associated the names of many of the purest and most exalted characters of the mediæval ages.

Among the earliest and most noteworthy of these reform movements was that which resulted in the founding in the year 910 of the celebrated monastery of Cluny in Burgundy. The influences which radiated from the cloisters of Cluny left a deep impression upon more than two centuries of history (secs. 123 and 133).

32. Services of the Monks to Civilization. — The early establishment of the monastic system in the Church resulted in great advantages to the new world that was shaping itself out of the ruins of the old. The monks, especially the Benedictines, became agriculturists, and by patient labor converted the wild and marshy lands which they received as gifts from princes and others into fruitful fields, thus redeeming from barrenness some of the most desolate districts of Europe.

The monks also became missionaries, and it was largely to their zeal and devotion that the Church owed her speedy and signal victory over the barbarians. It is about the names of such devoted monks as Saints Columba, Gallus, and Boniface that gathers much of the romance of the missions of the mediæval Church.

Fig. 7. — A Monk Copyist (From a manuscript of the fifteenth century)

The quiet air of the monasteries nourished learning as well as piety. The monks became teachers, and under the shelter of the monasteries established schools which were the nurseries of learning during the earlier Middle Ages and the homes for centuries of the best intellectual life of Europe.

The monks also became copyists, and with great painstaking and industry gathered and multiplied ancient manuscripts, and thus preserved and transmitted to the modern world much classical learning and literature that would otherwise have been lost. Almost all the remains of the Greek and Latin classics that we possess have come to us through the agency of the monks.

The monks also became the chroniclers of the events of their own times, so it is to them that we are indebted for a great part of our knowledge of the early mediæval centuries. Thus the scriptorium, or writing room of the monastery, held the place in mediæval society that the great publishing house holds in the modern world.

The monks became further the almoners of the pious and the wealthy, and distributed alms to the poor and needy. Everywhere the monasteries opened their hospitable doors to the weary, the sick, and the discouraged. In a word, these retreats were the inns, the asylums, and the hospitals of the mediæval ages. This spirit of helpfulness and charity found its embodiment in the women who became nuns. To a woman is to be attributed the establishment of the first Christian hospital.[1]

III. The Rise of the Papacy

33. The Empire within the Empire. — Long before the fall of Rome there had begun to grow up within the Roman Empire an ecclesiastical state, which in its constitution and its administrative system was shaping itself upon the imperial model. This spiritual empire, like the secular empire, possessed a hierarchy of officers, of which deacons, priests or presbyters, and bishops were the most important. The bishops collectively formed what is known as the episcopate. There were four grades of bishops, namely, country bishops, city bishops, metropolitans or archbishops, and patriarchs. At the end of the fourth century there were five patriarchates, that is, regions ruled by patriarchs. These centered in the great cities of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

Among the patriarchs, the patriarchs of Rome were accorded almost universally a precedence in honor and dignity. They

11 "A Roman lady, named Fabiola, in the fourth century founded at Rome, as an act of penance, the first public hospital, and the charity planted by that woman's hand overspread the world, and will alleviate, to the end of time, the darkest anguish of humanity." — Lecky, *History of European Morals*, vol. ii, p. 80; quoted by Wishart, *Monks and Monasteries*, p. 105.

claimed further a precedence in authority and jurisdiction, and this was already very widely recognized. Before the close of the eighth century there was firmly established over a great part of Christendom what we may call an ecclesiastical monarchy.

Besides the influence of great men, such as Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, and Nicholas I, who held the seat of St. Peter, there were various historical circumstances that contributed to the realization by the Roman bishops of their claim to supremacy and aided them vastly in establishing the almost universal authority of the see of Rome. In the following paragraphs we shall enumerate several of these favoring circumstances. These matters constitute the great landmarks in the rise and early growth of the Papacy.

34. **The Belief in the Primacy of St. Peter and in the Founding by him of the Church at Rome.** — The Catholic Church teaches that the apostle Peter was given by the Master primacy among his fellow apostles and, furthermore, that Christ intrusted that disciple with the keys of the kingdom of heaven and invested him with superlative authority as teacher and interpreter of the Word by the commission "Feed my sheep"; . . . "feed my lambs," thus giving into his charge the entire flock of the Church. It also teaches that the apostle Peter himself founded the church at Rome. Without doubt he preached at Rome and suffered martyrdom there under the Emperor Nero.

These beliefs and interpretations of history, which make the Roman bishops the successors of the first of the apostles and the holders of his seat, contributed greatly, of course, to enhance their reputation and to justify their claim to a primacy of authority over all the dignitaries of the Church.

35. **Advantages of their Position at the Political Center of the World.** — The claims of the Roman bishops were in the early centuries greatly favored by the spell in which the world was held by the name and prestige of imperial Rome. Thence it had been accustomed to receive commands in all temporal matters; how very natural, then, that thither it should turn for command and

guidance in spiritual affairs. The Roman bishops in thus occupying the geographical and political center of the world enjoyed a position of preëminence over all other bishops and patriarchs. The halo that during many centuries of wonderful history had gathered about the Eternal City came naturally to invest with a kind of aureole the head of the Christian bishop.

36. Effect of the Removal of the Imperial Government to Constantinople. — Nor was this advantage that was given the Roman bishops by their position at Rome lost when the old capital ceased to be an imperial city. The removal, by the acts of Diocletian and Constantine, of the chief seat of the government to the East, instead of diminishing the power and dignity of the Roman bishops, tended greatly to promote their claims and authority. It left the pontiff the foremost personage in Rome.

37. The Pastor as Protector of Rome. — With the advent of the barbarians there came another occasion for the Roman bishops to widen their influence and enhance their authority. Rome's extremity was their opportunity. Thus it will be recalled how mainly through the intercession of the pious Pope Leo the Great the fierce Attila was persuaded to turn back and spare the imperial city;[12] and how the same bishop, in the year A.D. 455, also appeased in a measure the wrath of the Vandal Geiseric and shielded the inhabitants from the worst passions of a barbarian soldiery.[13]

Thus when the emperors, the natural defenders of the capital, were unable to protect it, the unarmed Pastor was able, through the awe and reverence inspired by his holy office, to render services that could not but result in bringing increased honor and dignity to the Roman see.

38. Effects upon the Papacy of the Extinction of the Roman Empire in the West. — But if the misfortunes of the Empire in the

[12] Legend tells how Attila, after his retreat from Italy, being taunted for having allowed himself to be turned back by an unarmed bishop, replied, "It was not the bishop of whom I was afraid but the man who stood behind him." The legend explains that it was St. Peter whom Attila had seen standing with menacing gesture behind the pope. The legend, read aright, is true. Behind every venerated bishop and holy abbot the barbarians saw a heavenly figure, whose restraining gesture they dared not disregard.

[13] See *Ancient History*, secs. 558 and 559.

West tended to the enhancement of the reputation and influence of the Roman bishops, much more did its final downfall tend to the same end. Upon the surrender of the sovereignty of the West into the hands of the Emperor of the East, the bishops of Rome became the most important personages in Western Europe, and being so far removed from the court at Constantinople gradually assumed almost imperial powers.[14] They became the arbiters between the barbarian chiefs and the Italians, and to them were referred for decision the disputes arising between cities, states, and kings. Especially did the bishops and archbishops throughout the West in their contests with the Arian barbarian rulers look to Rome for advice and help. It is easy to see how greatly these things tended to strengthen the authority and increase the influence of the Roman bishops.

39. **The Missions of Rome.** — Again, the early missionary zeal of the church at Rome made her the mother of many churches, all of whom looked up to her with affectionate and grateful loyalty. Thus the Angles and Saxons, won to the faith by the missionaries of Rome, conceived a deep veneration for the holy see and became its most devoted children. To Rome it was that the Christian Britons made their most frequent pilgrimages, and thither they sent their offering of St. Peter's pence. And when the Saxons became missionaries to their pagan kinsmen of the Continent they transplanted into the heart of Germany these same feelings of filial attachment and love. The monk St. Boniface, "the Apostle of Germany," with whose labors we are already familiar (sec. 23), while winning the heathen of the German forests to a love for the Cross, inspired them also with a profound reverence for the Roman see. Boniface himself took a solemn oath of fealty to the Roman pontiff, and the bishops of the German churches that arose through the efforts of this zealous apostle were required to promise a like obedience to Rome.

[14] During this time Gregory the Great (590–604), who was the most eminent of the early popes, ruled as though he were a temporal prince, and administered affairs almost like an independent sovereign.

40. Result of the Fall of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria before the Saracens. — In the seventh century all the great cities of the East fell into the hands of the Mohammedans. This was a matter of tremendous consequence for the church at Rome, since in every one of these great capitals there was, or might have been, a rival of the Roman bishop. The virtual erasure of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria from the map of Christendom left only one city, Constantinople, that could possibly nourish a rival of the Roman church. Thus did the very misfortunes of Christendom give an added security to the ever-increasing authority of the Roman prelate.

41. The Iconoclastic Controversy; the Popes become Temporal Sovereigns. — A dispute about the use of images in worship, known in Church history as the "War of the Iconoclasts," which broke out in the eighth century between the Greek churches of the East and the Latin churches of the West, drew after it far-reaching consequences as respects the growing power of the Roman pontiffs.

Even long before the seventh century the churches both in the East and in the West had become crowded with images or pictures of the apostles, saints, and martyrs, which to the ignorant classes at least were objects of superstitious veneration. But the great disaster which just at this period befell the Church in the East — the irruption and conquests of the Arab Mohammedans — contributed to create among the Christians there a strong sentiment against the use of images as aids in worship. A party arose, who, like the party of reform among the ancient Hebrews, declared that God had given the Church over into the hands of the infidels because the Christians had departed from his true worship and fallen into idolatry. These opposers of the use of images in worship were given the name of Iconoclasts (image-breakers).

Leo the Isaurian, who came to the throne of Constantinople in 717, was a most zealous Iconoclast. The Greek churches of the East having been cleared of images, the Emperor resolved to clear also the Latin churches of the West of these symbols. To this end he issued a decree that they should not be used.

The bishop of Rome not only opposed the execution of the edict but by the ban of excommunication cut off the Emperor and all the iconoclastic churches of the East from communion with the true Catholic Church. Though images — paintings and mosaics only — were permanently restored in the Eastern churches in 842, still by this time other causes of alienation had arisen, and the breach between the two sections of Christendom could not now be closed. The final outcome was the permanent separation, in the last half of the eleventh century, of the Church of the East from that of the West. The former became known as the Greek, Byzantine, or Eastern Church; the latter, as the Latin, Roman, or Catholic Church.

The East was thus eventually lost to the Roman see, but the loss was more than made good by fresh accessions of power in the West. In this quarrel with the Eastern emperors the Roman bishops formed an alliance with the Frankish princes of the Carolingian house (sec. 72). We shall a little later tell briefly the story of this alliance. Never did allies render themselves more serviceable to each other. The popes consecrated the Frankish chieftains as kings and emperors; the grateful Frankish kings defended the popes against all their enemies, imperial and barbarian, and dowering them with cities and provinces, laid the basis of their temporal power.[15]

[15] The cause of the Roman pontiffs, from about the eighth or ninth century forward, was greatly furthered by two of the most surprising and successful forgeries in all history. These famous documents are known as the Donation of Constantine and the False Decretals. The probable object of the former was to justify the donation of Pippin (sec. 73) by providing evidence of a similar and earlier donation by the first imperial patron of the Church. It "tells how Constantine the Great, cured of his leprosy by the prayers of Sylvester, resolved . . . to forsake the ancient seat for a new capital on the Bosporus, lest the continuance of the secular government should cramp the freedom of the spiritual, and how he bestowed therewith upon the Pope and his successors the sovereignty over Italy and the countries of the West." — BRYCE, *The Holy Roman Empire*, p. 100.

The so-called Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, which appeared about the middle of the ninth century, tended to a similar end as did the Donation of Constantine, although they were originally put out in the interest of the bishops and not of the Pope. They formed part of a collection of Church documents, and included many alleged letters and edicts of the early popes. Granting their genuineness, they went to prove that the bishops of Rome in the second and third centuries exercised all that

Such in broad outline was the way in which grew up the Papacy, an institution which, far beyond all others, was destined to mold the fortunes and direct the activities of Western Christendom throughout the mediæval time.

Selections from the Sources. — BEDE, *Ecclesiastical History*. Read bk. i, chaps. xxiii–xxv; bk. ii, chaps. i and xiii; bk. iii, chaps. iii and xxv. *Translations and Reprints*, vol. ii, No. 7, "Life of St. Columban" (ed. by Dana Carleton Munro); an instructive biography of an Irish monk. HENDERSON, *Select Historical Documents*, pp. 274–314, "Tne Rule of Saint Benedict." *European History Studies* (Univ. of Nebraska), vol. ii, No. 6, "Monasticism." ATHANASIUS, *Life of St. Antony;* to be found in literal translation in KINGSLEY, *The Hermits*. See also ROBINSON, *Readings in European History*, vol. i, chap. v.

Secondary Works. — ZIMMER, *The Irish Element in Mediæval Culture;* an interesting account of the services rendered mediæval civilization by the Irish monks. KINGSLEY, *The Hermits*. MONTALEMBERT, *The Monks of the West;* an ardent eulogy of monasticism. WISHART, *A Short History of Monks and Monasteries;* the best short account in English. PUTNAM, *Books and their Makers during the Middle Ages*, vol. i; for the labors of the monks as copyists and illuminators. JESSOPP, *The Coming of the Friars*, chap. iii, "Daily Life in a Mediæval Monastery." HATCH, *The Organization of the Early Christian Church;* the best work on the subject from the Protestant side. FISHER, *History of the Christian Church*, the earlier chapters; concise, fair, and scholarly. EMERTON, *Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages*, chap. ix, "The Rise of the Christian Church," and chap. xi, "The Monks of the West." BARRY, *The Papal Monarchy*, chaps. i–v. ADAMS, *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. vi, "The Formation of the Papacy." CARDINAL GIBBONS, *The Faith of our Fathers*, chap. ix, "The Primacy of Peter," and chap. x, "The Supremacy of the Popes"; an authoritative statement of the Catholic view of these matters. MUNRO and SELLERY, *Mediæval Civilization*, pp. 60–86 and 114–158.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Conversion of the Angles and Saxons. 2. The Life of St. Antony. 3. St. Columba and Iona. 4. Whitby. 5. St. Benedict and Monte Cassino. 6. The scriptorium of the monastery.

authority and extensive jurisdiction which were now being claimed by the popes of the ninth century.

In that uncritical age the documents were received by everybody as authentic. The papal party quoted them in part proof of their claims for the Roman see. They are now acknowledged by all scholars, Catholic as well as Protestant, to have been forged. Laurentius Valla (1406–1457), one of the greatest of the humanists (sec. 300), was the first to demonstrate the real character of the Donation of Constantine.

CHAPTER IV

THE FUSION OF LATIN AND TEUTON

42. Introductory. — The conversion of the barbarians and the development in Western Christendom of the central authority of the Papacy prepared the way for the introduction among the northern races of the arts and the culture of Rome, and contributed greatly to hasten in Italy, Spain, and Gaul the fusion into a single people of the Latins and the Teutons, of which important matter we shall treat in the present chapter. We shall tell how these two races, upon the soil of the old Empire in the West, intermingled their blood, their languages, their laws, their usages and customs, to form new peoples, new tongues, and new institutions. We shall speak of only a few things and say only just enough to show how composite is the character of the structure that was reared on the site of the ancient Empire, out of the ruins of the broken-down civilization of Rome and the new contributions of the northern peoples.

43. The Romance Nations. — In some districts the barbarian invaders and the Roman provincials were kept apart for a long time by the bitter antagonism of race, and by a sense of injury on the one hand and a feeling of disdainful superiority on the other. But for the most part the Teutonic intruders and the Latin-speaking inhabitants of Italy, Spain, and France very soon began freely to mingle their blood by family alliances.

It is quite impossible to say what proportion the Teutons bore to the Romans. Of course the proportion varied in the different countries. In none of the countries named, however, was it large enough to absorb the Latinized population; on the contrary, the barbarians were themselves absorbed, yet not without changing very essentially the body into which they were incorporated.

Thus about the end of the fourth century everything in Italy, Spain, and France — dwellings, cities, dress, customs, language, laws, soldiers — reminds us of Rome. A little later and a great change has taken place. The barbarians have come in. For a time we see everywhere, jostling each other in the streets and markets, crowding each other in the theaters and courts, kneeling together in the churches, the former Romanized subjects of the Empire and their uncouth Teutonic conquerors. But by the close of the ninth century, to speak in very general terms, the two elements have become quite intimately blended, and a century or two later Roman and Teuton have alike disappeared, and we are introduced to Italians, Spaniards, and Frenchmen. These we call Romance nations, because at base they are Roman.

44. **The Formation of the Romance Languages.** — During the five centuries of their subjection to Rome, the natives of Spain and Gaul forgot their barbarous dialects and came to speak a corrupt Latin. Now, in exactly the same way that the dialects of the Celtic tribes of Gaul and of the Celtiberians of Spain had given way to the more refined speech of the Romans did the rude languages of the Teutons yield to the more cultured speech of the Roman provincials. In the course of two or three centuries after their entrance into the Empire, Goths, Lombards, Burgundians, and Franks had, in a large measure, dropped their own tongue and were speaking that of the people they had subjected.

But of course this provincial Latin underwent a great change upon the lips of the mixed descendants of the Romans and Teutons. Owing to the absence of a common popular literature, the changes that took place in one country did not exactly correspond to those going on in another. Hence, in the course of time, we find different dialects springing up, and by about the ninth century the Latin has virtually disappeared as a spoken language, and its place has been usurped by what will be known as the Italian, Spanish, and French languages, all more or less resembling the ancient Latin, and all called Romance tongues, because children of the old Roman speech.

45. **Consequences of the Confusion of Languages.**—We are now in a position to discern one of the causes that helped to render denser that dark pall of ignorance which, settling over Western Europe in the fifth century, continued almost unrelieved until the eleventh.

As the provincial Latin began to change, the language in which the books were written and the everyday speech began to diverge. Thus the manuscript rolls which held the wisdom of the Greeks and Romans soon became sealed to all save the learned. In this way the confusion of tongues conspired with the general confusion and anarchy of the times to extinguish the last rays of science and philosophy, and to deepen the gloom of the night that had settled upon all the lands once illumined by ancient learning and culture. Several centuries had necessarily to pass before the new languages forming could develop each a literature of its own (sec. 275). Meanwhile all learning was shut up within the walls of the monasteries. "For many centuries," says Hallam, "to sum up the account of ignorance in a word, it was rare for a layman, of whatever rank, to know how to sign his name." Charlemagne, king of the Franks, the most renowned personage of the five centuries immediately following the fall of Rome, was unable to write (sec. 76).

46. **The Personal Character of the Teutonic Laws.**—The laws of the barbarians were generally personal instead of territorial, as with us; that is, instead of all the inhabitants of a given country being subject to the same laws, there were different ones for the different classes of society. The Latins, for instance, were subject in private law only to the old Roman code, while the Teutons lived under the tribal rules and regulations which they had brought with them from beyond the Rhine and the Danube. The curious state of things resulting from this personality of law, as it is called, is vividly pictured by the following observation of a chronicler: "For it would often happen," he says, "that five men would be sitting or walking together, not one of whom would have the same law with any other."

Even among themselves the Teutons knew nothing of the modern legal maxim that all should stand equal before the law.

The penalty inflicted upon the evil doer depended not upon the nature of his crime but upon his rank or that of the party injured. Thus slaves and serfs were beaten and put to death for minor offenses, while a freeman might atone for any crime, even for murder, by the payment of a fine, the amount of the penalty being determined by the rank of the victim.

47. **Ordeals.** — The agencies relied upon by the Germans to ascertain the guilt or innocence of accused persons show in how rude a state the administration of justice among them was. One very common method of proof was by what were called ordeals, in which the question was submitted to the judgment of God. Of these the chief were the *ordeal by fire*, the *ordeal by water*, and the *wager of battle*.[1]

The *ordeal by fire* consisted in taking in the hand a piece of red-hot iron, or in walking blindfolded with bare feet over a row of hot plowshares laid lengthwise at irregular distances. If the person escaped unharmed, his innocence was held to be established.

Another way of performing the fire ordeal was by running through the flames of two fires built close together, or by walking over live brands; hence the phrase "to haul over the coals."

The *ordeal by water* was of two kinds, by hot water and by cold. In the hot-water ordeal the accused person thrust his arm into boiling water, and if no hurt was visible upon the arm three days after the operation, the party was considered guiltless. When we speak of one's being "in hot water," we use an expression which had its origin in this ordeal.

In the cold-water trial the suspected person was thrown into a stream or pond: if he floated, he was held guilty; if he sank, innocent. The water, it was believed, would reject the guilty, but receive the innocent into its bosom. The practice common in Europe until a very recent date of trying supposed witches by throwing them into a pond of water to see whether they would sink or float, grew out of this superstition.

[1] The wager of battle is by some writers treated as a distinct form of trial; but being an appeal to the decision of Heaven, it rested on the same principle as the trials by fire and water, and consequently is properly given a place among the ordeals.

The *trial by combat*, or *wager of battle*, was a solemn judicial duel. It was resorted to in the belief that God would give victory to the right. One circumstance that caused this form of the ordeal to be often invoked was the misuse of the kind of trial known as compurgation, or the *wager of law*.[2] This allowed a person accused of a crime to clear himself by simply swearing that he was innocent, provided he could get a sufficient number of his relatives or neighbors to swear that he was telling the truth.[3] The number of concurring witnesses was dependent upon the seriousness of the charge or the rank of the person making the oath. Now, this privilege was liable to abuse, and the only resort left to the injured person in such case was to challenge the perjurer to submit to the judgment of God as it should be pronounced in a solemn judicial combat. This form of trial grew into great favor. Naturally it was a favorite mode of trial among a people who found their chief delight in fighting. Even the judge in some cases resorted to it to maintain the authority and dignity of his court. To a person who had disregarded a summons the judge



FIG. 8.—TRIAL BY COMBAT. (From a manuscript of the fifteenth century; after *Lacroix*)

[2] The wager of law is not to be reckoned among the ordeals, as it lacked the essential element of an ordeal, namely, the appeal to the judgment of Heaven.

[3] In course of time this form of the oath was changed, so that the compurgators, as the witnesses were called, simply swore that they *believed* the oath of the accused to be true and clean.

would send a challenge in this form: "I sent for thee, and thou didst not think it worth thy while to come; I demand therefore satisfaction for this thy contempt." Religious disputes also were sometimes settled by this sort of "martial logic." In Spain as late as the eleventh century a contention as to which of two liturgies should be adopted was decided by a combat between two knights.

The ordeal was frequently performed by deputy, that is, one person for hire or for the sake of friendship would undertake it for another; hence the expression "to go through fire and water to serve one." Especially was such substitution common in the judicial duel, as women and ecclesiastics were generally forbidden to appear personally in the lists. There are instances mentioned, however, where even women performed the wager of battle; in which case, to equalize the conditions, the man was placed in a pit waist-deep, with his left hand tied behind his back.

FIG. 9.—WAGER OF BATTLE BETWEEN A MAN AND WOMAN. (From a manuscript of the fifteenth century; after Lea, *Superstition and Force*)

The champions, as the deputies were called, became in time a regular class in society, like the gladiators in ancient Rome. Religious houses and chartered towns hired champions at a regular salary to defend all the cases to which they might become a party. In order that the champion might be stimulated to do his best for the party he represented, he was hanged or suffered the loss of a hand or a foot if he allowed himself to be worsted in a combat.[4]

[4] There were many other forms of the ordeal, besides those we have given, in use among the different Teutonic tribes, some of which were plainly native customs, while others seem to have been introduced by the Christian priests. Thus, there was the ordeal by consecrated bread; if the morsel strangled the person, he was adjudged guilty. From this form of trial arose the expression, "May this morsel

48. **The Revival of the Roman Law.** — Now, the barbarian law system, if such it can be called, the character of which we have merely suggested by the preceding illustrations, gradually displaced the Roman law in all those countries where the two systems at first existed alongside each other, save in Italy and Southern France, where the provincials greatly outnumbered the invaders. But the admirable jurisprudence of Rome was bound to assert its superiority. About the close of the eleventh century there was a great revival in the study of the Roman law as embodied in the Justinian code, and in the course of a century or two this became either the groundwork or a strong modifying element in the law systems of almost all the peoples of Europe.

What took place may be illustrated by reference to the fate of the Teutonic languages in Gaul, Italy, and Spain. As the barbarian tongues, after maintaining a place in those countries for two or three centuries, at length gave place to the superior Latin, which became the basis of the new Romance languages, so now in the domain of law the barbarian maxims and customs, though holding their place more persistently, likewise finally give way, almost everywhere and in a greater or less degree, to the more excellent law system of the Empire. Rome must fulfill her destiny and give laws to the nations.

Though longer delayed in their adoption, the law maxims and principles of the Empire at length became more widely spread and influential than the Latin speech; for Germany, which never gave up her Teutonic tongue, finally adopted the Roman law system, to the degree of making its principles the basis of her jurisprudence. And even England, though she clung tenaciously to her Teutonic customs and maxims, just as she held on to her own Teutonic speech, could not escape the influence of the

be my last." In what was called the ordeal of the bier the person charged with murder was made to touch the body of the dead man; if the body stirred or blood flowed afresh from the wound, the man was held guilty of the murder.

Such ordeals are found among all primitive peoples. For proof by ordeal among the Hebrews, see Numbers v. 11–31 and Joshua vii. 16–18. The combat between David and Goliath, being an appeal to the judgment of Heaven, possesses the essential element of the judicial duel. We also find an ordeal in the test proposed by Elijah to the prophets of Baal, — 1 Kings xviii. 17–40.

Roman jurisprudence, which penetrated there, and, to a certain extent, chiefly through the courts of the Church, modified English law, just as the Latin in an indirect way finally modified and enriched the English speech, while leaving it the same in groundwork and structure. "Our laws," says Lord Bacon, "are mixed as our language; and as our language is so much the richer, the laws are the more complete."

Under the influence of the classical revival, the various ordeals, which were already disappearing before the growing enlightenment of the age and the steady opposition of the papal authority, rapidly gave way to modes of trial more consonant with reason and the spirit of the civil law.

Selections from the Sources. — HENDERSON, *Select Historical Documents*, pp. 176–189, "The Salic Law," and pp. 314–319, "*Formulæ Liturgicæ* in Use at Ordeals." LEE, *Source-Book*, chap. v, "Anglo-Saxon Laws." *Translations and Reprints*, vol. iv, No. 4, "Ordeals," etc. (ed. by Arthur C. Howland).

Secondary Works. — EMERTON, *Introduction to the Middle Ages*, chap. viii, "Germanic Ideas of Law." LEA, *Superstition and Force: Essays on the Wager of Law, the Wager of Battle, the Ordeal and Torture.* Invaluable to the student of primitive culture. MUNRO and SELLERY, *Mediæval Civilization*, pp. 310–325. HADLEY, *Introduction to Roman Law*, Lect. ii, "The Roman Law since Justinian."

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The formation of the Romance languages. 2. Weregild. 3. Ordeals. 4. The influence of the Roman law upon the law systems of Europe.

CHAPTER V

THE ROMAN EMPIRE IN THE EAST

49. The Era of Justinian (A.D. 527–565). — During the fifty years immediately following the fall of Rome, the Eastern emperors struggled hard and sometimes doubtfully to withstand the waves of the barbarian inundation which constantly threatened to overwhelm Constantinople with the same awful calamities that had befallen the imperial city of the West. Had the New Rome — the destined refuge for a thousand years of Græco-Roman learning and culture — also gone down at this time before the storm, the loss to the cause of civilization would have been incalculable.

Fortunately, in the year 527, there ascended the Eastern throne a prince of unusual ability, to whom fortune gave a general of such rare genius that his name has been allotted a place in the short list of the great commanders of the world. Justinian was the name of the prince, and Belisarius that of the soldier. The sovereign has given name to the period, which is called after him the "Era of Justinian."

50. Justinian as the Restorer of the Empire and "The Lawgiver of Civilization"; Calamities of his Reign. — One of the most important matters in the reign of Justinian is what is termed the "Imperial Restoration," by which is meant the recovery from the barbarians of several of the provinces of the West upon which they had seized. Africa, as we have seen (sec. 11), was first wrested from the Vandals. Italy was next recovered from the Goths and again made a part of the Roman Empire (A.D. 553). It was governed from Ravenna by an imperial officer who bore the title of *Exarch*. Besides recovering Africa and Italy from the barbarians, Justinian also reconquered from the Visigoths the southeastern part of Spain.

But that which gives Justinian's reign a greater distinction than any conferred upon it by the achievements of his generals was the collection and publication by him of the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, the "Body of the Roman Law." This work embodied all the law knowledge of the ancient Romans, and was the most precious legacy of Rome to the world.[1] In causing its publication Justinian earned the title of "The Lawgiver of Civilization."

Although the reign of Justinian was in many respects auspicious and brilliant, still it was for the Empire a time of almost unparalleled woes and sufferings. Among the calamitous events of the

THE ROMAN EMPIRE UNDER JUSTINIAN

period a prominent place must be given the seditions at Constantinople and the attendant destruction of property and loss of life. The parties or factions indulging in these disorders rose out of the chariot races of the circus. These games possessed a strange and fatal fascination for the populace of the capital, such as the gladiatorial spectacles had had for the debased multitudes of Old Rome. The people became divided into two leading factions, known as the Blues and the Greens. These factions carried their rivalries into all the relations of life, political and religious. Often they indulged in unseemly disturbances in the circus, even in the presence of the Emperor himself. In the year 532 there broke out what is known as the "Nika" riot, during which a large part

[1] See *Ancient History*, sec. 577.

of the city was reduced to ashes. The mob was finally enticed within the Hippodrome, where it was set upon by the soldiers of Belisarius and thirty-five thousand of the rioters were slain.

In the year 542, an awful pestilence, bred probably in Egypt, fell upon the Empire and did not wholly cease its ravages until about fifty years later. This plague was the most terrible scourge of which history has any knowledge, save perhaps the so-called Black Death, which afflicted Europe in the fourteenth century (sec. 217). It is believed to have carried off one third of the population of the Empire.

51. The Reign of Heraclius (A.D. 610–641). — For half a century after the death of Justinian the annals of the Eastern Roman Empire are unimportant. Then we reach the reign of Heraclius, a prince about whose worthy name gather matters of significance in world history.

About this time Chosroes II, king of Persia, wrested from the hands of the Eastern emperors the fortified cities that guarded the Euphratean frontier and overran all Syria, Egypt, and Asia Minor. For many years Heraclius battled heroically for the integrity of the Empire. The struggle between the two rivals was at last decided by a terrible combat known as the battle of Nineveh (A.D. 627). The Persian army was almost annihilated. Grief or violence ended the life of Chosroes. With his successor, Heraclius negotiated a treaty which restored the earlier boundaries of the Roman dominions.

A few years after this the Arabs, of whom we shall tell in the following chapter, entered upon their surprising career of conquest, which in a short time completely changed the face of the entire East. Heraclius himself lived to see — so cruel are the vicissitudes of fortune — the very provinces which he had recovered from the fire worshipers in the possession of the followers of the Arabian Prophet.

The conquests of the Arabs cut off from the Empire those provinces that had the smallest Greek element, and thus rendered the population subject to the Emperor more homogeneous, more thoroughly Greek. The Roman element disappeared, and though

the government still retained the imperial character impressed upon it by the conquerors of the world, the court of Constantinople became Greek in tone, spirit, and manners. Hence, instead of longer applying to the Empire the designation *Roman*, many historians from this on call it the *Greek* or *Byzantine* Empire.

52. **Services rendered European Civilization by the Roman Empire in the East.**[2] — The later Roman Empire rendered such eminent services to the European world that it justly deserves an important place in universal history. First, as a military outpost it held the Eastern frontier of European civilization for a thousand years against Asiatic barbarism.

Second, it was the keeper for centuries of the treasures of ancient civilization and the instructress of the new Western nations in law, in government and administration, in literature, in painting, in architecture, and in the industrial arts.

Third, it kept alive the imperial idea and principle, and gave this fruitful idea and this molding principle back to the West in the time of Charlemagne. Without the later Roman Empire of the East there would never have been a Romano-German Empire of the West (sec. 75).

Fourth, it was the teacher of religion and civilization to the Slavic races of Eastern Europe. Russia forms part of the civilized world to-day largely by virtue of what she received from New Rome.

Secondary Works. — GIBBON, chaps. xl–xliv; on the reign of Justinian. Chap. xliv deals with Roman jurisprudence. OMAN, *The Story of the Byzantine Empire*, chaps. iv–xi. HODGKIN, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. iv, "The Imperial Restoration." RAWLINSON, *The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*, chap. xxiv. *Encyc. Brit.*, article on Justinian by James Bryce. BURY, *History of the Later Roman Empire;* a work of superior scholarship. BÉMONT and MONOD, *Mediæval Europe*, chap. viii. HARRISON, *Byzantine History in the Early Middle Ages;* a brilliant lecture, which summarizes the results of the latest studies in the field indicated. MUNRO and SELLERY, *Mediæval Civilization*, pp. 87–113 and 212–223.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The recovery of Italy. 2. Belisarius. 3. Introduction into Europe of the silk industry. 4. Justinian as a builder. 5. The Code of Justinian. 6. The closing by Justinian of the schools of Athens.

[2] Bury's *History of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. ii, chap. xiv.

CHAPTER VI

THE RISE OF ISLAM

53. The Attack from the South upon Ancient Civilization. — We have seen the German barbarians of the North descend upon and wrest from the Roman Empire all its provinces in the West. We are now to watch a similar attack made upon the Empire by the Arabs of the South, and to see wrested from the emperors of the East a large part of the lands still remaining under their rule.[1]

54. Origin and Character of the Arabs. — The Arabs, who are now about to play their surprising part in history, are, after the Hebrews and the Phœnicians, the most important people of the Semitic race. The name *Saracen*, applied to them, is of doubtful origin, but seems to come from two Arabic words meaning "children of the desert." They are divided into two distinct classes, — dwellers in towns and dwellers in tents. It is to the latter class alone that the term *Bedouins* is properly applied. The virtues which these nomad Arabs most highly prize are hospitality, generosity, and fidelity to the ties of kinship.

Secure in their inaccessible deserts, the Arabs have never as a nation bowed their necks to a foreign conqueror, although portions of the Arabian peninsula have been repeatedly subjugated by different invaders.

55. The Religious Condition of Arabia before Mohammed. — Religion, which had had nothing to do with the fateful movement among the German barbarians, was the inciting cause of the great Arabian revolution.

Before the reforms of Mohammed the Arabs were idolaters. Their holy city was Mecca. Here was the ancient and most revered shrine of the Kaaba,[2] where was preserved a sacred black

[1] The student should make a careful study of the maps after pp. 8 and 52.

[2] So named from its having the shape of a cube.

stone that was believed to have been given by an angel to Abraham. To this Meccan shrine pilgrimages were made from the most remote parts of Arabia.

But though polytheism was the prevailing religion of Arabia, still there were in the land many followers of other faiths. The Jews especially were to be found in some parts of the peninsula in great numbers, having been driven from Palestine by the Roman persecutions. From them the Arab teachers had been made acquainted with the doctrine of one sole God. From the



FIG. 10. — THE KAABA AT MECCA

numerous Christian converts dwelling among them they had learned something of the doctrines of Christianity. In view of these antecedents of the religion which Mohammed gave his people, his creed appears to some scholars to be essentially "Judaism as adapted to Arabia," while to others it presents itself as an heretical or modified form of Christianity.

About the time to which we have now come there was much religious unrest in Arabia. As it was in Judea at the time of the appearance of Christ, so was it now in this southern land. There were here many seekers after God, — men who, dissatisfied with the old idolatry, were ready to embrace a higher faith.

Such was the religious condition of the tribes of Arabia about the beginning of the seventh century of our era when there appeared among them a Prophet under whose teachings the followers of all the idolatrous worships were led to give assent to a single and simple creed, and were animated by a fanatical enthusiasm that drove them forth from their deserts upon a career of conquest which could not be stayed until they had overrun the fairest portions of the Roman and Persian empires, and given a new religion to a large part of the human race.

56. **Mohammed.** — Mohammed, the great Prophet of the Arabs, was born in the holy city of Mecca, probably in the year A.D. 570. He sprang from the distinguished tribe of the Koreish, the custodians of the sacred shrine of the Kaaba. In his early years he was a shepherd and a watcher of flocks by night, as the great religious teachers Moses and David had been before him. Later he became a merchant and a camel driver.

Mohammed possessed a soul that was early and deeply stirred by the contemplation of those themes that ever attract the religious mind. He declared that he had visions in which the angel Gabriel appeared to him and made to him revelations which he was commanded to make known to his fellow-men. The starting point of the new faith which he was to teach was this: There is but one God, and Mohammed is his Prophet.

For a long time Mohammed endeavored to gain adherents merely by persuasion; but such was the incredulity which he everywhere met that at the end of three years his disciples numbered only forty persons.

57. **The Hegira** (A.D. 622). — The teachings of Mohammed at last aroused the anger of a powerful party among the Koreish, who feared that they as the guardians of the national idols of the Kaaba would be compromised in the eyes of the other tribes by allowing such heresy to be openly taught by one of their number, and accordingly they began to persecute Mohammed and his followers.

To escape these persecutions Mohammed fled to the neighboring city of Medina. This *Hegira*, or Flight, as the word signifies, occurred A.D. 622, and was considered by the Moslems as such

an important event in the history of their religion that they adopted it as the beginning of a new era, and from it still continue to reckon historical dates.

58. **Mohammed at Medina.** — At this time Medina was merely a cluster of clan villages on an oasis of the desert. Bitter feuds divided the clans, and the community was in a state of genuine Arab anarchy. Mohammed at once assumed the functions of an arbiter and lawgiver. He framed for the community a remarkable charter or constitution, which united the warring clans into a little commonwealth, — the nucleus of the great Arabian Empire. His government was a theocracy, like that of ancient Israel. Mohammed was not now, as while at Mecca, simply a prophet, but a legislator, judge, and king. It is only by bearing in mind his changed position that we shall understand his work and acts at Medina and be enabled to judge them justly.

As prophet, Mohammed continued to make known the revelations that came to him. A large part of the Koran, but not the part of loftiest religious feeling, was given at Medina. In the little rude mosque which he had caused to be built as a place of devotion and assemblage, the apostle preached to the people and led them in the service of prayer. In this service he made an innovation of the greatest significance. At first he had enjoined upon his followers in praying to turn, as did the Jews, towards Jerusalem, but failing in his efforts to win over this people, of whom there was a large number settled in the suburbs of Medina, and to persuade them to recognize him as a true prophet, he broke with them, and commanded his disciples in praying to turn towards Mecca. This meant that the attempt to effect a fusion of Judaism and Islam had failed, and that Islam was to run its course as a distinct religion.

As lawgiver and judge, Mohammed decided the various cases, civil and religious, brought to him. The decisions rendered by him and the precedents he set form the chief basis of the law system of the Moslem world to-day.

As chief or king, Mohammed, like his prototype David, planned and led border raids and military campaigns. The year after the

Hegira he sent out an expedition to intercept a caravan of the Koreish and to make it a prize. This was in strict accord with Arab rule and custom, for the Koreish in expelling Mohammed from Mecca and in attempting to kill him had established a state of war between him and themselves. This marauding soon led to a pitched battle (the so-called battle of Bedr, A.D. 624) between the Meccans and the followers of Mohammed, which resulted in a signal victory for the Moslems. This was the beginning of the holy wars of Islam.[3]

59. Capture of Mecca; Arabia acknowledges Mohammed as a true Prophet. — In the tenth year of the Hegira, the Meccans having violated a truce which they had entered into with the new state at Medina, Mohammed at the head of an army of ten thousand Bedouins marched against Mecca and captured the city almost without a blow. The Prophet dealt most magnanimously with his former persecutors. Only a very few were proscribed. It was the idols alone in the place that were given over to destruction. Entering the Kaaba, Mohammed exclaimed, "Truth has come and error has fled away." He then ordered that all the idols there should be hewn down.

The capture of Mecca constitutes a great landmark in the career of Islam. The Arabian tribes now almost unanimously turned to Mohammed as a true Prophet. During the year following the fall of Mecca so many embassies of submission came to him that this is called the "Year of Deputations." The once rejected Prophet had become the spiritual and military head of the innumerable Arab clans, whom the intense ardor of religious enthusiasm had welded into a mighty brotherhood and nation. There is nothing outside the realm of miracles more wonderful than this quick triumph of Islam over the Arab race and the change wrought in them by the force of a great conviction.[4]

[3] Mohammed about this time gave his followers the following revelation, which had great influence in securing for early Islam its remarkable military successes: "And those who are slain in God's cause, their works shall not go wrong; He . . . will make them enter into Paradise which He has told them of." — THE KORAN, sura xlvii, 5 (Palmer's trans.).

[4] Without doubt, as is maintained by many, the Arab's love of warfare and hope of plunder had much to do in bringing about this amazing revolution; but, as in the

In the founding of the Moslem state, Mohammed without doubt was guilty of many cruel and unjust acts; but it is also equally certain that the establishment of his empire was attended by less injustice and cruelty than marks the establishment of any other Asiatic state known to history, — from the Kingdom of Israel in Palestine to the British Empire in India.

In the tenth year of the Hegira Mohammed made a farewell pilgrimage to Mecca. He there spoke to a vast throng of forty thousand pilgrims, closing what he felt to be his last public address with these words: "O Lord, I have delivered my message and fulfilled my mission." A few months later he died, and was buried at Medina, and his tomb there is to-day a most sacred place of pilgrimage for the Moslem world.

60. The Origin of the Koran. — Before going on to trace the conquests of the successors of Mohammed, we must try to form some idea of the religion of the great Prophet.

The doctrines of Mohammedanism, or Islam, which means "submission to God," are contained in the Koran, which is believed by the orthodox to have been written from all eternity on tablets in heaven. From time to time the apostle recited[5] to his disciples portions of the "heavenly book" as its contents were revealed to him in his dreams and visions. These communications were held in the "breasts of men," or were written down upon bones, pieces of pottery, and the ribs of palm leaves. Soon after the death of the Prophet these scraps of writing were religiously collected, supplemented by tradition, and then arranged chiefly according to length. Thus came into existence the sacred book of Islam.

61. The Teachings of the Koran. — The fundamental doctrine of the creed embodied in the Koran is the unity of God: "There is no God save Allah" echoes through the book. To this is added the equally binding declaration that "Mohammed is the Prophet of Allah."

case of the later crusading movement in Christendom, we shall not be wrong in making religious feeling its chief moving principle.

[5] Palmer in the introduction to his translation of the Koran says that it is "probable Mohammed could neither read nor write."

The Koran inculcates four cardinal virtues. The first of these is prayer: five times every day must the believer turn his face towards Mecca and engage in devotion. The second requirement is almsgiving. The third is keeping the fast of Ramadan, which lasts a whole month. The fourth duty is making a pilgrimage to Mecca. Every person who can possibly do so is required to make this journey.

To the faithful the Koran promises a heaven filled with every sensual delight, with flowers and fruits and bright-eyed maidens (houris) of ravishing beauty, and threatens unbelievers and the doers of evil with the torments of a hell filled with every horror of flame and demon.

62. The Sunna. — Islam is not based upon the Koran alone. It rests in part upon what is known as the *Sunna*, that is, a great body of traditions of the Prophet's sayings, — those not forming a part of the sacred book, — his actions, practices, and decisions handed down from his immediate companions. The first collection of these was made in the second century after Mohammed's death. These traditions are regarded by the orthodox Moslem as being almost as sacred and authoritative as the words of the Koran itself. In regard to its significance for the development of Islam, we may compare the Sunna to the body of traditions handed down alongside the Bible in the Christian Church, and which has so greatly influenced the development particularly of Catholic Christianity.

63. The Conquest of Persia, Syria, Egypt, and North Africa. — For exactly one century after the death of Mohammed the caliphs or successors of the Prophet[6] were engaged in an almost unbroken series of conquests. Persia was subjugated and the authority of the Koran was established throughout the land of the Zend-Avesta. Syria was wrested from the Eastern Roman Empire and Asia Minor was overrun. Egypt and North Africa, the latter just

[6] Abu Bekr (A.D. 632–634), Mohammed's father-in-law, was the first caliph. He was followed by Omar (A.D. 634–644), Othman (A.D. 644–655), and Ali (A.D. 655–661), all of whom fell by the hands of assassins, for from the very first dissensions were rife among the followers of the Prophet. Ali was the last of the four so-called orthodox caliphs.


20
15
10
5
0
5
10
15
20
25
45
40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
FRANCIA
Tours
AQUITANIA
BURGUNDIA
Oviedo
Narbonne
Arles
Luna
Ravenna
Pisa
Donube R.
Lisbon
Toledo
Zaragoza
Ebro R.
Tagus R.
CORSICA
Rome
M. Cassino
ANDALOS
BALEARIC IS.
SARDINIA
Naples
Amalfi
Salerno
Thessalonica
MACEDONIA
Hadrianople
Otranto
Guadiana R.
Seville
Merida
Cordova
Granada
Guadalquivir R.
Cadiz
Str. of Gibraltar
Gibraltar
Tangier
Ceuta
MEDITERRANEAN
Palermo
SICILY
Syracuse
Athens
MOROCCO
Kairouan
TUNIS
MALTA
CRETE
Tripoli
AFRICA
Alexa
GREATEST EXTENT
OF THE
SARACEN DOMINIONS
C. A. D. 750
0
5
10
15
20
Longitude
25
East

35
40
45
50
55
60
65
70
75
80
45
40
35
30
20
15
10
5
T U R K S
Jaxartes R.
CASPIAN SEA
Oxus R.
Sogd
Samarcand
Balkh
KHORASMIA
KHORASAN
R. Indus
HINDUSTAN
ARAD
Araxes R.
IRAK AJEMI
Thebarmes
Edessa
Nineveh
Tigris R.
MESOPOTAMIA
Euphrates R.
Aleppo
Antioch
Baadad
Ctesiphon
Isfahan
Yezd
FARS
KERMAN
SIND
Moultan
Shiraz
Bussorah
IRAK ARABI
Cadesia
Damascus
Berytus
Sidon
Tyre
Tiberias
Ptolemais (Acre)
Jaffa
Ascalon
Jerusalem
Pelusium
Cæsarea
CYPRUS
Trapezus (Trebizond)
Angora
Dorylæum
Iconium
Hejaz
Medina
Mecca
Nejd
Oman
Muscat
Hamyarites
Hadramat
ABYSSINIA
from 35 Greenwich 40
45
50
55
60

recently delivered from the Vandals, were also snatched from the hands of the Byzantine emperors.

By the conquest of Persia Zoroastrianism, a religion with a great past, was, as a force in history, destroyed.[7] By the conquest of Syria the birthplace of Christianity was lost to the Christian world. By the conquest of North Africa lands whose history for a thousand years had been intertwined with that of the opposite shores of Europe, and which at one time seemed destined to share in the career of freedom and progress opening to the peoples of that continent, were drawn back into the fatalism and the stagnation of the East. From being an extension of Europe they became once more an extension of Asia.

64. Attacks upon Constantinople. — Thus in only a little more than fifty years from the death of Mohammed his standard had been carried by the lieutenants of his successors through Asia to the Hellespont on the one side and across Africa to the Straits of Gibraltar on the other. We may expect to see the Saracens at one or both of these points attempt the invasion of Europe.

The first attempt was made in the East (A.D. 673–677), where the Arabs endeavored to gain control of the Bosporus by wresting Constantinople from the hands of the Eastern emperors. After repeated unsuccessful assaults they abandoned the undertaking. Forty years later (A.D. 717–718) the city was again invested by a powerful Saracen fleet and army; but the skill and personal heroism of the Emperor Leo the Isaurian, the use by the besieged of a recently invented combustible compound known as *marine fire* ("Greek fire"), and timely aid from the Bulgarians saved the capital for several centuries longer to the Christian world.

This check that the Saracens received before Constantinople was doubtless next in importance for European civilization to the

[7] The number of Guebers or fire worshipers in Persia at the present time is about 100,000, found for the most part at Yezd and in the province of Kerman. A larger number may be counted in Western India, — the descendants of the Guebers who fled from Persia at the time of the Arabian invasion. They are there called Parsees, from the land whence they came. After the English, they are the most enterprising, intelligent, and influential class in India to-day.

check given their conquering hordes a little later in France at the great battle of Tours.

65. **The Conquest of Spain** (A.D. 711). — While the Moslems were thus being repulsed from Europe at its eastern extremity, the gates of the continent were opened to them — legend says by treachery — at the western, and they gained a foothold in Spain. At the great battle of Xeres (A.D. 711) the last of the Visigothic kings was hopelessly defeated, and all the peninsula save some mountainous regions in the northwest quickly submitted to the invaders. By this conquest some of the fairest provinces of Spain were lost to Christendom for a period of eight hundred years.

No sooner had the subjugation of the country been effected than multitudes of colonists from Arabia, Syria, and North Africa crowded into the peninsula, until in a short time the provinces of Seville, Cordova, Toledo, and Granada became predominantly Arabic in dress, manners, language, and religion.

66. **Invasion of France; Battle of Tours** (A.D. 732). — Four or five years after the conquest of Spain the Saracens crossed the Pyrenees and established themselves upon the plains of Gaul. This advance of the Moslem host beyond the northern wall of Spain was viewed with the greatest alarm by all Christendom. It looked as though the followers of Mohammed would soon possess all the continent. As Draper pictures it, the Crescent, lying in a vast semicircle upon the northern shore of Africa and the curving coast of Asia, with one horn touching the Bosporus and the other the Straits of Gibraltar, seemed about to round to the full and overspread all Europe.

In the year 732, just one hundred years after the death of the Prophet, the Franks, under their leader Charles Martel, and their allies met the Moslems upon the plains of Tours in the center of Gaul and committed to the issue of a single battle the fate of Christendom and the future course of history. The Arabs suffered an overwhelming defeat and soon withdrew behind the Pyrenees.

The young Christian civilization of Western Europe was thus delivered from an appalling danger such as had not threatened it since the fearful days of Attila and the Huns.

67. Changes in the Caliphate; its Golden Age at Bagdad. — Only eighteen years after the battle of Tours an important event marked the internal history of the caliphate. After the assassination of Ali,[8] a usurper, Moawiyah by name, was recognized as caliph. He succeeded in making the office hereditary instead of elective or appointive, as it had been hitherto, and thus established what is known as the dynasty of the Ommeiades,[9] the rulers of which family for nearly a century (A.D. 661–750) issued their commands from the city of Damascus.

The house of the Ommeiades was overthrown by the adherents of the house of Ali, who established a new dynasty (A.D. 750), known as that of the Abbassides, so called from Abbas, an uncle of Mohammed. The new family, soon after coming to power, established the seat of the royal residence on the lower Tigris, and upon the banks of that river founded the renowned city of Bagdad, which was destined to remain the abode of the Abbasside caliphs for a period of five hundred years.

The golden age of the caliphate of Bagdad covered the latter part of the eighth and the ninth century of our era, and was illustrated by the reigns of such princes as Al-Mansur (A.D. 754–775) and the renowned Harun-al-Raschid (A.D. 786–809). During this period science and philosophy and literature were most assiduously cultivated by the Arabian scholars, and the court of the caliphs presented in culture and luxury a striking contrast to the rude and barbarous courts of the kings and princes of Western Christendom.

68. The Dismemberment of the Caliphate. — "At the close of the first century of the Hegira," writes Gibbon, "the caliphs

[8] See sec. 63, n. 6.

[9] So called from Omeyyah, an ancestor of Moawiyah. In securing their power the Ommeiades had caused the murder of the two sons of Ali, Hassan and Hosain. These youths were ever regarded as martyrs by the friends of the house of Ali, and the schism caused by their cruel death has never been healed. The Mohammedans of Persia, who are known as Shiahs, are the leaders of the party of Ali, while the Turks and Arabs, known as Sunnites, are the chief adherents of the opposite party. These latter take their name from the fact that they hold the Sunna (sec. 62) as sacred and authoritative. The Shiahs, on the other hand, reject all these traditions of the Prophet save such as can be traced back to Ali or to his immediate posterity.

were the most potent and absolute monarchs of the globe. The word that went forth from the palace at Damascus was obeyed on the Indus, on the Jaxartes, and on the Tagus." Scarcely less potent was the word that at first went forth from Bagdad. But in a short time the extended empire, through the quarrels of sectaries and the ambitions of rival aspirants for the honors of the caliphate, was broken in fragments, and from three capitals — from Bagdad upon the Tigris, from Cairo upon the Nile, and from Cordova upon the Guadalquivir — were issued the commands of three rival caliphs, each of whom was regarded by his adherents as the sole rightful spiritual and civil successor of Mohammed. All, however, held the great Prophet in the same reverence, all maintained with equal zeal the sacred character of the Koran, and all prayed with their faces turned toward the holy city of Mecca.

69. **The Civilization of Arabian Islam.**[10] — The Saracens were coheirs of antiquity with the Germans. They made especially their own the scientific[11] accumulations of the ancient civilizations and bequeathed them to Christian Europe. These elements of civilization they added to and enriched, and in several of the countries of which they took possession, especially in Babylonia and in Spain, there developed a civilization which in some respects far surpassed any that the world had yet seen.

In the arrangements of their court, the organization of their army, and the administration of their government the Arabs imitated the Persians or the Byzantine Greeks. Their government was an absolute monarchy, such as has always been the favorite form among Oriental peoples.

The Moslem law system, the basis of which is found in the Koran, was the most original creation of the Arab mind. After the Roman law, it is probably the most influential and widely obeyed system of laws and regulations that any race or civilization has developed. Since the system embraces religious as well as civil matters, it is in some respects like the Mosaic code, from

[10] Kremer's *Culturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen*, chaps. vii and ix.

[11] Gibbon affirms that no Greek poet, orator, or historian was ever translated into Arabic. See *Decline and Fall*, chap. lii.

which it freely borrowed. It deals with all kinds of subjects, ranging from prayer and pilgrimages to contracts and inheritances.

Commerce and trade, in all the countries of which the Arabs made themselves masters, assumed a fresh activity and a new importance. The Arabs in Babylonia and Syria became the heirs and successors of the ancient Chaldæans and Phœnicians, and re-created that commercial activity of the earlier time that nourished the great cities of Babylon, Tyre, and Sidon. As in the *Odyssey* of Homer we have a mirror of the commercial activity and the adventurous trade voyages of the early maritime Greeks, so in the marvelous stories of *Sindbad the Sailor* we have a like mirror of the voyages and adventures of the Arabian sailors.

In the lighter forms of literature — romance and poetry — the Arabs produced much that possesses a high degree of excellence. In the field of romance they followed the Persian story-tellers. The inimitable tales of the *Arabian Nights*, besides being a valuable commentary on Arabian life and manners at the time of the culmination of Oriental culture at the court of Bagdad, forms also an addition to the imperishable portion of the literature of the world. The poetry of the Arabs was wholly original. It was the natural and beautiful expression of the Arabian genius.

The physical sciences were also pursued by the Arabian scholars with great eagerness and with considerable success. Geography was forced upon their attention by their wide conquests and their extended trade relations. From the Greeks and the Hindus they received the germs of astronomy, geometry, arithmetic, algebra, medicine, botany, and other sciences. Almost all of the sciences that thus came into their hands were improved and enriched by them, and then transmitted to European scholars.[12] They made medicine for the first time a true science. They devised

[12] What Europe received in science from Arabian sources is kept in remembrance by such words as *alchemy*, *alcohol*, *alembic*, *algebra*, *alkali*, *almanac*, *azimuth*, *chemistry*, *elixir*, *zenith*, and *nadir*. To how great an extent the chief Arabian cities became the manufacturing centers of the mediæval world is indicated by the names which these places have given to various textile fabrics and other articles. Thus *muslin* comes from Mosul, on the Tigris, *damask* from Damascus, and *gauze* from Gaza. Damascus and Toledo blades tell of the proficiency of the Arab workmen in metallurgy.

what is known from them as the Arabic or decimal system of notation,[13] and gave to Europe this indispensable instrument of all scientific investigations dependent upon mathematical calculations.

All this literary and scientific activity naturally found expression in the establishment of schools, universities, and libraries. In all the great cities of the Arabian Empire, as at Bagdad, Cairo, and

FIG. 11. — THE MOSQUE OF CORDOVA. (From a photograph)

Cordova, centuries before Europe could boast anything beyond cathedral or monastic schools, great universities were drawing together vast crowds of eager young Moslems and creating an atmosphere of learning and refinement. The famous university at Cairo, which has at the present day an attendance of several thousand students, is a survival from the great days of Arabian Islam.

In the erection of mosques and other public edifices the Arab architects developed a new and striking style of architecture, — some of the most beautiful specimens of which are preserved to

[13] The figures or numerals, with the exception of the zero symbol, employed in their system they seem to have borrowed from India.

us at Cordova and Granada in Spain, — a style which has given to modern builders some of their finest models.

70. **The Evil and the Good in Islam.** — The first-fruits of Islam might well lead one to regard it as a faith conducive to culture; but it must be borne in mind that the splendid civilization of Bagdad, Cairo, and Cordova was, in great measure at least, a reflected glory. The relation of this brilliant culture to that of the declining Byzantine and Persian empires has been aptly illustrated by likening it to the clouds which gather about the setting sun and are lighted up by it with a splendor not their own.

In many of its teachings and institutions Islam, in truth, is a system unfavorable to social progress. In opposition to Christianity, it tolerates polygamy[14] and places no restraint upon divorce, thus destroying the sacredness of family life. In authorizing the faithful to make slaves of their captives in holy wars, it legalizes slavery; Mohammedan countries are the main strongholds of slavery at the present time. It also fosters religious intolerance; the Moslem is forbidden by his religion to grant equality to unbelievers. Again, it unites in the same hands both religious and civil authority and thereby creates despotism.

Still another most serious defect of Islam is found in the immutable character of its system of laws. All the enactments and judicial decisions of Mohammed and of the first four caliphs are regarded as binding, at least in spirit, for all time. Since the system covers the civil as well as the religious sphere, Mohammedan law has been prevented from adapting itself to the changing needs of society. This is doubtless one cause of the unprogressive character of Mohammedan society as contrasted with the progressive civilization of the Western races, who were the fortunate inheritors of the admirable secular, and therefore flexible, system of the Roman law.

Islam, however, inculcates some inspiring truths and recommends some great virtues. Like Christianity it teaches the unity of God, immortality, and retributive rewards and punishments

[14] The Koran (sura iv, 3) allows the believer to take "two, or three, or four wives, and not more." By a special dispensation (sura xxxiii, 49) Mohammed was allowed to take a larger number. At one time the Prophet had ten wives.

after death. These doctrines render it immeasurably superior to fetichism or to polytheism, and have made it a great force for the uplift of multitudes of idolatrous tribes in Asia and Africa.

Among the leading virtues inculcated by Islam is that of temperance. The Koran forbids positively to the believer the use of wine and inferentially of all strong drinks. To this prohibition is attributable the fact that drunkenness is less common and open in Mohammedan than in Christian lands.

Finally, in forming our estimate of Islam we should carefully bear in mind that the religion as held and practiced by the different Mohammedan races to-day, particularly by the Ottoman Turks, is a very degenerate form of the Islamic faith when compared with that held and practiced by the Arabs, the people among whom it first arose. Mohammedanism, like Christianity, was at its best in what we may call its Apostolic Age.

Selections from the Sources. — The KORAN, like the Bible for Christianity, is our chief source for a knowledge of Islam as a religion. The translation by Palmer, in *Sacred Books of the East*, is the best. *The Speeches and Table-Talk of the Prophet Mohammed* (trans. by Stanley Lane-Poole). *European History Studies* (Univ. of Nebraska), vol. ii, No. 3, "Selections from the Koran."

Secondary Works. — MUIR, *The Corân*, *The Life of Mohammed*, *Annals of the Early Caliphate*, and *The Rise and Decline of Islam*. All these works are based on the original sources; they are, however, written in an unsympathetic spirit. SMITH, *Mohammed and Mohammedanism;* has a short bibliography. IRVING, *Mahomet and his Successors.* GIBBON, *The Decline and Fall*, chaps. l–lii. CARLYLE, *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, Lect. ii, "The Hero as Prophet." FREEMAN, *History and Conquests of the Saracens;* a rapid sketch by a master. GILMAN, *The Saracens from the Earliest Times to the Fall of Bagdad;* contains a list of over two hundred books bearing on the subject. SYED AMEER ALI, *The Spirit of Islam: or the Life and Teachings of Mohammed;* by a Mohammedan barrister at law. Also the same author's *Short History of the Saracens.* POOLE, *Studies in a Mosque.* SMITH, *The Bible in Islam*, chap. x, "Church and State"; for Mohammed's position at Medina. MUNRO and SELLERY, *Mediæval Civilization*, pp. 224–239. The articles by Wellhausen, Nöldeke, and Guyard, under the word *Mohammedanism* in the *Encyc. Brit.*, have a very special value.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Mohammed at Medina. 2. The conquest of Egypt by the Arabs. 3. The caliph Harun-al-Raschid. 4. The *Arabian Nights.* 5. The Moors in Spain.

CHAPTER VII

CHARLEMAGNE AND THE RESTORATION OF THE EMPIRE IN THE WEST

71. **Introductory.** — We return now to the West. The Franks, who with the aid of their confederates withstood the advance of the Saracens upon the field of Tours and saved Europe from subjection to the Koran, are the people that first attract our attention. Charlemagne, or Charles the Great, their king, is the imposing figure that moves amidst all the events of the times, — indeed, is the one who makes the events and renders the period an epoch in universal history.

The story of this era affords the key to very much of the subsequent history of Western Europe. The mere enumeration of the events which are to claim our attention will illustrate the important and germinal character of the period. We shall tell how the mayors of the palace of the Merovingian princes became the actual kings of the Franks; how, through the liberality of the Frankish kings, the popes laid the foundations of their temporal sovereignty; and how Charlemagne restored the Roman Empire in the West, and throughout its extended limits, in the fusion of things Roman and of things Germanic, laid the basis of modern civilization.

72. **How Duke Pippin became King of the Franks** (A.D. 751). — Charles Martel, who saved the Christian civilization of Western Europe on the field of Tours, although the real head of the Frankish nation, was nominally only an officer of the Merovingian court (sec. 12). He died without ever having borne the title of king, notwithstanding he had exercised all the authority of that office.

But Charles' son, Pippin III, aspired to the regal title and honors. He resolved to depose his titular master and to make

himself king. Not deeming it wise, however, to do this without the sanction of the Pope, he sent an embassy to represent to him the state of affairs and to solicit his advice. Mindful of recent favors that he had received at the hands of Pippin, the Pope gave his approval to the proposed scheme by replying that it seemed altogether reasonable that the one who was king in reality should be king also in name. This was sufficient. Childeric — such was the name of the Merovingian king — was straightway deposed, and Pippin, whose own deeds together with those of his illustrious father had done so much for the Frankish nation and for Christendom, was crowned king of the Franks (A.D. 751), and thus became the first of the Carolingian line, the name of his illustrious son Charles (Charlemagne) giving name to the house.

73. Pippin helps to establish the Temporal Power of the Popes (A.D. 756). — In the year A.D. 754 Pope Stephen II, troubled by the king of the Lombards, besought Pippin's aid against the barbarian. Pippin, quick to return the favor which the head of the Church had rendered him in the securing of his crown, straightway interposed in behalf of the Pope. He descended into Italy with an army, expelled the Lombards from their recent conquests, and made a donation to the Pope of the regained lands[1] (A.D. 756). As a symbol of the gift he laid the keys of Ravenna, Rimini, and of many other cities on the tomb of St. Peter.

This endowment may be regarded as having practically laid the basis of the temporal sovereignty of the popes; for although Pope Stephen, as it seems, had already resolved to cast off allegiance to the Eastern Emperor and set up an independent Church state, still it is not probable that he could have carried out such an enterprise successfully had he not been aided in his project by the Frankish king.

74. Accession of Charlemagne; his Wars. — Pippin died in the year 768, and his kingdom passed into the hands of his two sons, Carloman and Charles, the latter being better known by the name he achieved of Charlemagne, or "Charles the Great." Three years

[1] The sovereignty of all these lands belonged nominally to the Emperor at Constantinople. His claims were ignored by Pippin.

after the accession of the brothers, Carloman died, and Charles took possession of his dominions.

Charlemagne's long reign of nearly half a century — he ruled forty-six years — was filled with military expeditions and conquests, by which he so extended the boundaries of his dominions that they came to embrace the larger part of Western Europe. He made over fifty military campaigns, the chief of which were against the Lombards, the Saracens, the Saxons, and the Avars.

Among the first undertakings of Charlemagne was a campaign against the Lombards, whose king, Desiderius, was troubling the Pope. Charlemagne wrested from Desiderius all his possessions, shut up the unfortunate king in a monastery, and placed on his own head the famous "Iron Crown" of the Lombards (sec. 13).

In the year 778 Charlemagne gathered his warriors for a crusade against the Mohammedan Moors in Spain. He crossed the Pyrenees and succeeded in winning from the Moslems all the northeastern corner of the peninsula. These lands thus regained for Christendom he made a part of his dominions, under the title of the Spanish March.[2]

But by far the greater number of the campaigns of Charlemagne were directed against the still pagan Saxons. These people were finally reduced to permanent submission and forced to accept Charlemagne as their sovereign and Christianity as their religion.

To the east and the southeast, behind the German tribes that Charlemagne had reduced to obedience, were the Avars, a race terrible as the Huns of Attila, and an offshoot seemingly of the same stock. In a series of campaigns Charlemagne broke their power and reduced the race to a tributary condition. This subjugation of the Avars was one of the greatest services that he rendered the young Christian civilization of Europe. For three centuries they had been the scourge of all their neighbors.

[2] As Charles was leading his victorious bands back across the Pyrenees, the rear of his army, while hemmed in by the walls of the Pass of Roncesvalles, was set upon by the wild mountaineers (the Gascons) and cut to pieces before he could give relief. Of the details of this event no authentic account has been preserved; but long afterwards, associated with the fabulous deeds of the hero Roland, it formed a favorite theme of the tales and songs of the Trouveurs of Northern France (sec. 243).

75. **Restoration of the Empire in the West** (A.D. 800). — An event of seemingly little real moment, yet in its influence upon succeeding affairs of the very greatest importance, now claims our attention. Pope Leo III having called upon Charlemagne for aid against a hostile faction at Rome, the king soon appeared in person at the capital and punished summarily the disturbers of the peace of the Church. The gratitude of Leo led him at this time to make a most signal return for the many services of the Frankish king. To understand his act a word of explanation is needed.

For a considerable time a variety of circumstances had been fostering a growing feeling of enmity between the Italians and the emperors at Constantinople. Just at this time, by the crime of the Empress Irene, who had deposed her son, Constantine VI, and put out his eyes that she might have his place, the Byzantine throne was vacant, in the estimation of the Italians, who contended that the crown of the Cæsars could not be worn by a woman. In view of these circumstances Pope Leo and those about him conceived the purpose of taking away from the heretical and effeminate Greeks the imperial crown and bestowing it upon some strong and orthodox and worthy prince in the West.

Now, among all the Teutonic chiefs of Western Christendom there was none who could dispute in claims to the honor with the king of the Franks, the representative of a most illustrious house and the strongest champion of the young Christianity of the West against her pagan foes. Accordingly, as Charlemagne was participating in the solemnities of Christmas Day in the basilica of St. Peter at Rome, the Pope approached the kneeling king, and placing a crown of gold upon his head proclaimed him Emperor and Augustus (A.D. 800).

The intention of Pope Leo was, by a sort of reversal of the act of Constantine the Great, to bring back from the East the seat of the imperial court; but what he really accomplished was a restoration of the line of emperors in the West, which three hundred and twenty-four years before had been ended by Odoacer, when he dethroned Romulus Augustulus and sent the royal vestments

ORKNEY IS.
SHETLAND IS.
THE HEBRIDES
IONA
Lindisfarne
Teel R.
Whitby
York
Humber R
London
Canterbury
Northumbria
Mercia
Anglo-Saxons
Danes
Northmen
Swedes
R. Eider
Hamburg
Saxons
Paderborn
New Corbey
AACHEN (Aix-la-Chapelle)
AUSTRASIA
NEUSTRIA
Paris
Verdun
Frankfurt
BOHEMIA
Chalons
Tours
St. Gall
BAVARIA
Lyons
Geneva
AQUITANIA
BURGUNDY
Milan
Venice
CANTABRIA
GASCONY
Pass of Roncesvalles
Arles
Ravenna
SPANISH MARCH
Saragossa
EMIRATE OF CORDOVA
Lisbon
Tagus R.
Toledo
Seville
CORDOVA
Xeres
Granada
Guadiana R.
Guadalquivir R.
Strait of Gibraltar
Cadiz
Ceuta
Tangier
MOROCCO
BALEARIC IS.
CORSICA
SARDINIA
ROME
Naples
Salerno
Amalfi
Palermo
SICILY
Syracuse
MALTA
Carthage
Tunis
Kairouan
CALIPHATE
Tripoli
EUROPE
IN THE TIME OF
CHARLES THE GREAT
814
Roman Empire of the
Roman Empire of the
and its dependent Sta

25
30
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
Novgorod
Kief
Dnieper R.
Cherson
Danube R.
BULGARIA
Sophia
Philippopolis
CONSTANTINOPLE
Hadrianople
Nicomedia
BITHYNIA
Angora
Nicæa
Dorylæum
PHRYGIA
Philadelphia
Iconium
Trapezus (Trebizond)
Araxes R.
Edessa
Nineveh
Tigris
MESOPOTAMIA
Antioch
Aleppo
RHODES
CYPRUS
CRETE
Berytus
Sidon
Tyre
Damascus
Tiberias
Ptolemais (Acre)
Nazareth
Jaffa
Ascalon
Jerusalem
Pelusium
Cæsarea
Gaza
Alexandria
BAGDAD
Ctesiphon
Cufa
Euphrates
Western Caliphate
Eastern Caliphate
Medina
Mecca

to Constantinople. We say this was what he actually effected; for the Greeks of the East, disregarding wholly what the Roman people and the Pope had done, maintained their line of emperors just as though nothing had occurred in Italy. So now from this time on for centuries there were, most of the time, two emperors, one in the East and another in the West, each claiming to be the rightful successor of Cæsar Augustus.[3]

This revival of the Empire in the West was one of the most important matters in European history. It gave to the following centuries "a great political ideal," which was the counterpart of the religious ideal of a Universal Church embodied in the Papacy, and which was to shape large sections of mediæval history.

76. Charles the Great as a Ruler. — Charlemagne must not be regarded as a warrior merely. His most noteworthy work was that which he effected as a legislator and administrator. In this field, too, were exhibited the finer qualities of his masterful personality. In building up his great empire Charlemagne practiced much cruelty and unrighteousness, but over this empire, once established, he ruled with the constant solicitude of a father.

Among the characteristic institutions of the Empire was the Diet, or General Assembly, a survival manifestly of the old Teutonic folkmote, an assembly of freemen. This body held a meeting every year in the spring.[4] At these gatherings there took place merely an interchange of views between Charlemagne and the assembled freemen of the realm; for the Diet was not a legislative body. Its functions were confined to giving the

[3] From this time on it will be proper for us to use the terms *Western* Empire and *Eastern* Empire. These names should not, however, be employed before this time, for the two parts of the old Roman Empire were simply administrative divisions of a single empire; but we may properly enough speak of the Roman Empire *in* the West, and the Roman Empire *in* the East, or of the Western and Eastern emperors. What it is very essential to note is, that the restoration of the line of the Western emperors actually destroyed the unity of the old Empire, so that from this time on until the destruction of the Eastern Empire in 1453, there were, as we have said in the text, two rival emperors, each in theory having rightful suzerainty of the whole world, whereas the two emperors in Roman times were the co-rulers of a single and indivisible World Empire. See Bryce's *The Holy Roman Empire.*

[4] In the autumn there gathered a second smaller assembly, or council, which was composed solely of the magnates of the Empire and the chief royal advisers.

Emperor advice and information. Its relation to Charlemagne is well shown by the words with which he is represented as having once addressed one of its meetings: "Counsel me," he said, "that I may know what to do."

In connection with the General Assembly we should notice the celebrated Capitularies of Charlemagne. These were not laws proper, but collections of decrees, decisions, and instructions covering matters of every kind, civil and religious, public and domestic. Some of them were drawn up with the concurrence of the Diet; a greater number embodied simply Charlemagne's own ideas of what his chiefs or his subjects needed in the way of advice, suggestion, or command.

Another noteworthy feature of the government of Charlemagne was the itinerant commissioners (*missi dominici*) whose duty it was to visit at stated intervals all parts of a given circuit, observe how the local magistrates were discharging their several duties, correct what was wrong, and report to the Emperor all matters of which he should be informed. This was an admirable device for putting the head of the vast Empire in close and almost personal touch with all its parts near and remote.

Charlemagne, particularly after his coronation as Emperor, exercised as careful a superintendence over religious as over civil affairs. He called synods or councils of the clergy of his dominions, presided at these meetings, revised the canons of the Church, and addressed to abbots and bishops fatherly words of admonition, reproof, and exhortation.

Education was also a matter to which Charlemagne gave zealous attention. He was himself from first to last as diligent a student as his busy life permitted. His biographer, Einhard, says that he could repeat his prayers as well in Latin as in German, and that he understood Greek, although he had difficulty in its pronunciation. He never ceased to be a learner. In his old age he tried to learn to write, but found that it was too late.

Distressed by the dense ignorance all about him, Charlemagne labored to instruct his subjects, lay and clerical, by the establishment of schools and the multiplication and dissemination of books

through the agency of the copyists of the monasteries. He invited from England the celebrated Alcuin, one of the finest scholars of the age, and with his help organized what became known as the Palace School, in which his children and courtiers and he himself were pupils. A spirit of rare comradeship seems to have pervaded this happy school. The different members of it were in pleasantry given Hebrew or classical names. Charlemagne was known as King David; Alcuin, as Flaccus; while still others bore the names of Homer, Pindar, Samuel, Columba, and Jeremiah.

A great number of other schools were established by Charlemagne in connection with the cathedrals and monasteries throughout his dominions. Many of these were organized by Alcuin, whose influence was unbounded. In causing the establishment of these schools Charlemagne set at work influences that left a deep and permanent impression upon European civilization. They mark the beginning of a new intellectual life for Western Christendom.

77. The Death of Charlemagne (814); his Place in History. — Charlemagne enjoyed the imperial dignity only fourteen years, dying in 814. Einhard in speaking of the event simply says that he was buried on the day of his death within the basilica at Aachen, which he himself had built. A later tradition affirms that the dead monarch was placed upon a throne, with his royal robes about him, his good sword by his side, and a book of the Gospels open on his lap.[5] It seemed as though men could not believe that his reign was over. And it was not.

By the almost universal verdict of students of the mediæval period, Charles the Great has been pronounced the most imposing personage that appears between the fall of Rome and the fifteenth century. "He stands alone," says Hallam, "like a beacon upon a waste, or a rock in the broad ocean." He is the King Arthur of the French, — the favorite hero of mediæval minstrelsy. His

[5] This account differs so widely from that of contemporaries of Charlemagne that it cannot be received as historical. Consult Lindner, *Die Fabel von der Bestattung Karls des Grossen;* Mombert, *Charles the Great*, pp. 484–486; and Hodgkin, *Charles the Great*, p. 250.

greatness has erected an enduring monument for itself in his name, the one by which he is best known, — Charlemagne.

78. **The Results of his Reign.** — Among the many results of the reign of Charlemagne we should take notice of the three following. First, he did for Germany what Cæsar did for Gaul, — brought this barbarian land within the pale of civilization and made it a part of the new-forming Romano-German world.

Second, through the part he played in the revival of the Empire, he helped to give to the following generations "a great political ideal," and to set up an authority among the European princes which was destined to lend character to large sections of mediæval history.

Third, Charlemagne kneaded into something like a homogeneous mass the various racial elements composing the mixed society of the wide regions over which he ruled. Throughout his long and vigorous reign that fusion of Roman and Teuton of which we spoke in a previous chapter went on apace. He failed indeed to unite the various races of his extended dominions in a permanent political union, but he did much to create among them those religious, intellectual, and social bonds which were never afterwards severed. From his time on, as it has been concisely expressed, there was a Western Christendom.

79. **Division of the Empire; the Treaty of Verdun** (843). — Like the kingdom of Alexander and that of many another great conqueror, the mighty empire of Charlemagne fell to pieces soon after his death. "His scepter was the bow of Ulysses which could not be drawn by any weaker hand."

Charlemagne was followed by his son Lewis, surnamed the Pious (814–840). Upon his death fierce contention broke out afresh among his surviving sons, Lewis, Charles, and Lothair, and myriads of lives were sacrificed in the unnatural strife. Finally, by the famous Treaty of Verdun (843), the Empire was divided as follows: to Lewis was given the part east of the Rhine, the nucleus of the later Germany; to Charles, the part west of the Rhone and the Meuse, one day to become France; and to Lothair, the narrow central strip between these, stretching across

THE WESTERN EMPIRE
As Divided at Verdun
843
0 50 100 200 300
Scale of Miles.
NORTH SEA
ATLANTIC OCEAN
IRELAND
ANGLO-SAXON KINGDOM
London
English Channel
DENMARK
Hamburg
R. Elbe
Frisians
SAXONY
KINGDOM OF LOUIS
R. Oder
SLAVS
Paderborn
Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle)
R. Rhine
AUSTRASIA
Frankfurt
BOHEMIA
KINGDOM OF CHARLES
LOTHARINGIA
R. Meuse
R. Saône
R. Seine
Paris
Verdun
NEUSTRIA
R. Loire
Tours
R. Danube
BAVARIA
R. Inn
St. Gall
AVARS
R. Drave
R. Save
AQUITANIA
Lyons
Geneva
BURGUNDY
KINGDOM OF LOTHAIR
Milan
Venice
R. Po
Ravenna
R. Rhone
R. Garonne
GASCONY
Arles
Pass of Roncesvalles
SPANISH MARCH
R. Ebro
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
ADRIATIC SEA
SERVIA
Corsica
Rome
R. Tiber
BENEVENTUM
5° THE M.-N. WORKS, BUFFALO.

Europe from the North Sea to the Mediterranean, and including the rich lands of the lower Rhine, the valley of the Rhone, and Italy. To Lothair also was given the imperial title.

This treaty is celebrated, not only because it was the first great treaty among the European states, but also on account of its marking the divergence from one another, and in some sense the origin, of two of the great nations of modern Europe, — Teutonic Germany and Romanic France. As shown by the celebrated bilingual oath of Strassburg,[6] there had by this time grown up in Gaul, through the mixture of the provincial Latin with German elements, a new speech, which was to grow into the French tongue, — the firstborn of the Romance languages.[7]

After this dismemberment of the dominions of Charlemagne the annals of the different branches of the Carolingian family become intricate, wearisome, and uninstructive. A fate as dark and woeful as that which, according to Grecian story, overhung the royal house of Thebes seemed to brood over the house of Charlemagne. In all its different lines a strange and adverse destiny awaited the lineage of the great king. The tenth century witnessed the extinction of the family.

80. **Renewal of the Empire by Otto the Great** (962). — In the division of the dominions of Charlemagne, the imperial title, as we have just seen, went to Lothair. The title, however, meant scarcely anything, carrying with it little or no real authority. Matters ran on thus for more than a century, the empty honor of the title sometimes being enjoyed by the kings of Italy, and again by those of the Eastern Franks.

But with the accession of Otto I to the throne of Germany in the year 936, there appeared among the princes of Europe a second Charlemagne. Besides being king of Germany, he became, through interference on request in the affairs of Italy, king of that country also. Furthermore, he wrested large tracts

[6] This was an oath of friendship and mutual fidelity taken by Lewis and Charles just before the Treaty of Verdun (in 842). The text of the oath has been preserved both in the old German speech and in the new-forming Romance language. It is interesting as affording the oldest existing specimens of these languages.

[7] Compare secs. 44 and 241.

of land from the Slavs, and forced the Danes, Poles, and Hungarians to acknowledge his suzerainty. Thus favored by fortune, he conceived the idea of reviving once more the imperial authority, just as it had been revived in the time of the great Charles.

So in 962, just a little more than a century and a half after the coronation at Rome of Charlemagne, Otto, at the same place and by the same papal authority, was crowned Emperor of the Romans. For a generation no one had borne the title. From this time on it was the rule that the prince whom the German Electors chose as their king had a right to the crown of Italy and also to the imperial crown.

After this the Empire came to be called the *Holy Roman Empire*, although, as Voltaire very truthfully observed concerning it later, it was "neither holy, nor Roman, nor an empire." Respecting the great part that the idea of the Empire played in subsequent history we shall speak in a later chapter (Chapter XI).

Selections from the Sources. — EGINHARD (Einhard), *Life of the Emperor Karl the Great.* Einhard was Charles' confidential friend and secretary. "Almost all our real, vivifying knowledge of Charles the Great," says Hodgkin, "is derived from Einhard, and . . . the *Vita Caroli* is one of the most precious bequests of the early Middle Ages." HENDERSON, *Select Historical Documents*, pp. 189–201, "Capitulary of Charlemagne, issued in the year 802." *Translations and Reprints*, vol. vi, No. 5, "Selections from the Laws of Charles the Great" (ed. by Dana Carleton Munro).

Secondary Works. — HODGKIN, *Charles the Great*, and MOMBERT, *A History of Charles the Great;* the first is the best short biography in English. BRYCE, *The Holy Roman Empire*, chaps. iv, v, and xxi; gives a clear view of the import of the restoration of the Empire. EMERTON, *Introduction to the Middle Ages*, chaps. xii–xiv. SERGEANT, *The Franks*, chaps. xvi–xxii; an admirable sketch, with a calm and moderate appraisement of Charles' work. WEST, *Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools*, and MULLINGER, *The Schools of Charles the Great;* for the influence upon the intellectual life of the Middle Ages of the schools founded by Charlemagne. FREEMAN, *The Chief Periods of European History*, Lects. iii and iv. ADAMS, *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. vii. DAVIS, *Charlemagne.*

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Charlemagne and the Saxons. 2. Romances connected with Charlemagne's expedition against the Moors in Spain. 3. Alcuin and the Palace School. 4. Tradition of the burial of Charlemagne.

CHAPTER VIII

THE NORTHMEN: THE COMING OF THE VIKINGS

81. The Northern Folk. — Northmen, Norsemen, Scandinavians, are different names applied in a general way to the early inhabitants of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. For the reason that those making settlements in England came for the most part from Denmark, the term Danes is often used with the same wide application by the English writers. These people were very near kin to those tribes — Goths, Vandals, Franks, Anglo-Saxons, and the rest — that seized upon the western provinces of the Roman Empire. They were Teutons in language, religion, habits, and spirit.

82. The Northmen as Pirates and as Colonizers. — For the first eight centuries of our era the Norsemen are practically hidden from our view in their remote northern home; but towards the end of the eighth century their black piratical crafts are to be seen creeping along the coasts of Britain, Ireland, and Gaul, and even venturing far up the inlets and creeks.

Every summer these dreaded sea rovers made swift descents upon the exposed shores of these countries, plundered, burned, murdered; and then upon the approach of the stormy season they returned to winter in the sheltered fiords of the Northern peninsulas. After a time the bold corsairs began to winter in the lands they had harried during the summer; and soon all the shores of the countries visited were dotted with their stations and settlements. With a foothold once secured, fresh bands came from the crowded lands of the North; the winter stations grew into permanent colonies; the surrounding country was gradually wrested from the natives; and in course of time the settlements coalesced into a real kingdom.

Thus Northern Gaul fell at last so completely into the hands of the Northmen as to take from them the name of *Normandy;* while Northeastern England, crowded with settlers from Denmark and surrendered to Danish rule, became known as the *Danelagh* (Dane-law). From Normandy, as a new base of operations, fresh colonies went out and made conquests and settlements in South Italy and Sicily, and in England. While these things were going on in Europe, other bands of Northmen were pushing out into the western seas and colonizing Iceland and Greenland, and visiting the shores of the American continent.

Commencing in the latter part of the eighth century, these marauding expeditions and colonizing enterprises



FIG. 12. — A VIKING SHIP

It was the custom of the Northmen to bury their dead sea king near the sea in his ship and over the spot to raise a great mound of earth. The boat shown in the cut was found in 1880 in a burial mound at Gokstadt, South Norway. Its length is 78 feet. From the mode of sepulture it is inferred that the mound was raised between A.D. 700 and 1000

did not cease until the eleventh century was far advanced. The consequences of this wonderful outpouring of the Scandinavian peoples were so important and lasting that the movement may well be compared, as it has been, to the great migration of their German kinsmen in the fifth and sixth centuries. Europe is a second time inundated by the Teutonic barbarians.

The most noteworthy characteristic of these Northmen is the readiness with which they laid aside their own manners, habits, ideas, and institutions, and adopted those of the country in which they established themselves. "In Russia they became Russians; in France, Frenchmen; in Italy, Italians; in England, Englishmen."

83. Colonization of Iceland and Greenland; the Discovery of America. — Iceland was settled by the Northmen in the ninth century,[1] and about a century later Greenland was discovered and colonized. In 1874 the Icelanders celebrated the thousandth anniversary of the settlement of their island, an event very like our Centennial of 1876.

America was reached by the Northmen as early as the opening of the eleventh century; the "Vinland" of their traditions was probably some part of the New England coast. Whether these first visitors to the continent ever made any settlements in the new land is a disputed question.



DISCOVERIES OF THE NORTHMEN

84. The Norsemen in Russia. — While the Norwegians were sailing boldly out into the Atlantic and taking possession of the isles and coasts of the western seas, the Swedes were pushing their crafts across the Baltic and troubling the Finns and Slavs on the eastern shore of that sea. Either by right of conquest or through the invitation of the contentious Slavonic clans, the renowned Scandinavian chieftain

[1] Iceland became the literary center of the Scandinavian world. There grew up here a class of scalds, or bards, who, before the introduction of writing, preserved and transmitted orally the sagas, or legends, of the Northern races. About the middle of the thirteenth century these poems and legends were gathered into collections known as the *Elder* or *Poetic Edda* and the *Younger* or *Prose Edda*. These are among the most interesting and important of the literary memorials that we possess of the early Teutonic peoples. They reflect faithfully the beliefs, manners, and customs of the Norsemen, and the wild, adventurous spirit of their sea kings.

Ruric acquired, about the middle of the ninth century, kingly dignity, and became the founder of the first royal line of Russia. The state established by him and his descendants was the beginning, or rather the prototype, of the great empire of the modern Tsars.

85. **The Danish Conquest of England.** — The Northmen — Danes, as called by the English writers — began to make descents upon the English coast toward the close of the eighth century. These sea rovers spread the greatest terror throughout the island; for they were not content with plunder, but, being pagans, took special delight in burning the churches and monasteries of the now Christian Anglo-Saxons, or English, as we shall hereafter call them. In a short time fully one half of England was in their hands. The wretched English were subjected to exactly the same treatment that they had inflicted upon the Celts. Just when it began to look as though they would be wholly enslaved or driven from the island by the heathen intruders, Alfred (871–901), later to be known as Alfred the Great,[2] came to the throne of Wessex.

For six years the youthful king fought heroically at the head of his brave thanes; but each year the possessions of the English grew smaller, and finally Alfred and his few remaining followers were forced to take refuge in the woods and morasses. After a time, however, the affairs of Alfred began to mend. He gained some advantage over the Danes, but he could not expel them from the island, and by the celebrated Treaty of Wedmore (878) gave up to them all the northeastern part of England.

[2] Alfred is the only sovereign of England on whom the title of Great has been conferred. Perhaps his best claims to this distinction spring from his work as a lawgiver and a patron of learning. He collected and revised the ancient laws of the Anglo-Saxons, tempering and altering them in accordance with Christian morals and principles. The code that he thus made formed the basis of early English jurisprudence. Alfred also fostered learning by himself becoming a translator. With the exception of the Bible, some short poems, and the well-known *Paraphrase of the Scriptures* (see sec. 22), the translations by Alfred were the first books written in their own tongue that the English had placed in their hands. Here we have the beginnings of the prose literature of England. "The mighty roll of the prose books that fill her libraries," writes Green, "begins with the translations of Alfred, and above all with the Chronicle of his reign." The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle here alluded to was a minute and chronological record of events, probably begun in *systematic form* in Alfred's reign and continued down to the year 1154. It was kept by the monks of different monasteries, and forms one of our most valuable sources for early English history.

THE M.-N. CO., BUFFALO, N. Y.

For a full century following the death of Alfred his successors were engaged in a constant struggle to hold in restraint the Danes already settled in the land, or to protect their domains from the plundering inroads of fresh bands of pirates from the Northern peninsulas. In the end the Danes got the victory, and Canute, king of Denmark, became king of England (1016). For eighteen years he reigned in a wise and parental way.

Altogether the Danes ruled in England about a quarter of a century, and then the old English line was restored in the person of Edward the Confessor (1042).

86. Settlement of the Northmen in Gaul. — The Northmen began to make piratical descents upon the coasts of Gaul before the end of the reign of Charlemagne. The great king had been dead only thirty years when these sea rovers ascended the Seine and sacked Paris (845).

We need not stop to give in detail the story of their subsequent plundering expeditions in Gaul and of their final settlement in the northwest of the country, for this is simply a repetition of the tale of the Danish forays and settlement in England. At last, the Carolingian king, Charles the Simple, did something very like what Alfred the Great had done across the Channel only a short time before. He granted to Rollo, the leader of the Northmen who had settled at Rouen, a considerable section of country in the north of Gaul, upon condition of homage and conversion (912). In a short time the newcomers had adopted the language, the manners, and the religion of the French, and had caught much of their vivacity and impulsiveness of spirit, without, however, any loss of their own native virtues. This transformation in their manners and life we may conceive as being recorded in their transformed name, — Northmen becoming softened into Norman.

87. Normandy in French History. — The establishment of a Scandinavian settlement in Gaul proved a most momentous matter, not only for the history of the French people, but for the history of European civilization as well. This Norse factor was destined to be one of the most important of all those various racial elements which on the soil of the old Gaul blended to

create the richly dowered French nation. For many of the most romantic passages of her history France is indebted to the adventurous spirit of the descendants of these wild rovers of the sea. The knights of Normandy lent an added splendor to French knighthood, and helped greatly to make France the hearth of chivalry and the center of the crusading movement of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Nor was the influence of the incoming of this Scandinavian race felt upon French history alone. Normandy became the point of departure of enterprises that had deep and lasting consequences for Europe at large. These undertakings had for their arena England and the Mediterranean lands. Their results were so important and far-reaching that we shall devote to the narration of them a subsequent chapter (Chapter X).

Selections from the Sources. — *The Heimskringla*, or *Chronicle of the Kings of Norway* (trans. by Samuel Laing). These sagas are of surpassing value to us for the reason that, in the words of Keary, they are "the last articulate voice of Teutonic heathenism." *The Story of Burnt Njal* (trans. by George W. Dasent). An Icelandic saga; a picture of times and manners. MABIE, *Norse Stories, retold from the Eddas.* COLBY, *Selections*, Nos. 8, 9, and 10. KENDALL, *Source-Book*, chap. ii, "England and the Danes."

Secondary Works. — KEARY, *The Vikings in Western Christendom.* The author depicts the various Viking undertakings as "one phase . . . of the long struggle between Christianity and the heathenism of the North." PAULI, *The Life of Alfred the Great;* the best life of the great king. GREEN, *The Conquest of England;* all excepting chaps. x and xi. DU CHAILLU, *The Viking Age;* reflects the life and ideals, customs and manners of the Norsemen, chiefly as depicted in the sagas. HUGHES, *Alfred the Great.* The millenary celebration of Alfred's death has called into existence an "Alfred Library." Among these recent books the following should be noticed: MACFADYEN, *Alfred, the West Saxon*, and BOWKER, *Alfred the Great.* BOYESEN, *The Story of Norway;* the opening chapters.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The physical characteristics of Scandinavia. 2. Manners and customs of the Northmen. 3. The Eddas. 4. The Icelanders' millennial anniversary, 1874. 5. Discovery of America by the Northmen. 6. Tales and legends of Alfred the Great.

SECOND PERIOD — THE AGE OF REVIVAL

(From the Opening of the Eleventh Century to the Discovery of America by Columbus in 1492)

CHAPTER IX

FEUDALISM AND CHIVALRY

I. Feudalism

88. Feudalism defined. — Feudalism is the name given to a special form of society and government, based upon a peculiar tenure of land, which prevailed in Europe during the latter part of the Middle Ages, attaining, however, its most perfect development in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries.

The three most essential features of the system were: (1) the holding of land from a lord or superior; (2) the existence of a close personal bond between the grantor of an estate and the receiver of it; (3) the full or partial rights of sovereignty which the holder of an estate had over those living upon it.

An estate of this nature — it might embrace a few acres or an entire kingdom — was called a *fief* or *feud*, whence the term Feudalism. The person granting a fief was called the *suzerain*, *liege*, or *lord*; the one receiving it, his *vassal*, *liegeman*, or *retainer*.

A person receiving a large fief might parcel it out in tracts to others on terms similar to those on which he himself had received it. This regranting of feudal lands was known as *subinfeudation*; in principle it was not unlike what we know as the subletting of lands. The process of subinfeudation might be carried to almost any degree. Practically it was seldom carried beyond the fourth stage.

89. **The Ideal System.** — The few definitions given above will render intelligible the following explanation of the theory of the feudal system. We take the theory of the system first for the reason that it is infinitely simpler than the thing itself. In fact, feudalism, as we find it in actual practice, was one of the most complex institutions that the mediæval ages produced.

In theory all the kings of the earth were vassals of the Emperor, who according to good imperialists was God's vassal, and according to good churchmen, the Pope's. The kings received their dominions as fiefs to be held on conditions of loyalty to their suzerain and of fealty to right and justice. Should a king become disloyal or rule unjustly and wickedly, through such misconduct he forfeited his fief, and it might be taken from him by his suzerain and given to another worthier liegeman.

In the same way as the king received his fief from the Emperor, so might he grant it out in parcels to his chief men, they, in return for it, promising, in general, to be faithful to him as their lord, and to serve and aid him. Should these men, now vassals, be in any way untrue to their engagement, they forfeited their fiefs, and these might be resumed by their suzerain and bestowed upon others.

In like manner these immediate vassals of the king, or suzerain, might parcel out their domains in smaller tracts to others, on conditions similar to those upon which they had themselves received theirs; and so on down through any number of stages.

We have thus far dealt only with the soil of a country. We must next notice what disposition was made of the people under this system.

The king in receiving his fief was intrusted with sovereignty over all persons living upon it; he became their commander, their lawmaker, and their judge, — practically, their absolute and irresponsible ruler. Then, when he parceled out his fief among his great men, he invested them, within the limits of the fiefs granted, with all his own sovereign rights. Each vassal became a virtual sovereign in his own domain. And when these great vassals subdivided their fiefs and granted portions of them to

others, they in turn invested their vassals with more or less of those powers of sovereignty with which they themselves had been clothed.[1]

To illustrate the workings of the system, we will suppose the king, or suzerain, to be in need of an army. He calls upon his own immediate vassals for aid; these in turn call upon their vassals; and so the order runs down through the various stages of the hierarchy. Each lord commands only his own vassals. The retainers in the lowest rank rally around their respective lords, who, with their bands, gather about their lords, and so on up through the rising tiers of the hierarchy, until the immediate vassals of the suzerain, or lord paramount, present themselves before him with their graduated trains of followers. The array constitutes a feudal army, — a splendidly organized body in theory, but in fact an extremely poor instrument for warfare.

Such was the ideal feudal state. It is needless to say that the ideal was never perfectly realized. The system simply made more or less distant approaches to it in the several European countries. But this general idea which we have tried to give of the theory of the system will help to an understanding of it as we find it in actual existence.

We will now in three distinct paragraphs say a word about the probable origin of the three prominent elements of the system, — namely, the *fief*, the *patronage*, and the *sovereignty*.

90. The Origin of Fiefs. — In the sixth century probably the greater portion of the soil of the countries which had once formed a part of the Roman Empire in the West was held by what was called an *allodial* or *freehold* tenure. The landed proprietor owned his domain absolutely, held it just as a man among us holds his estate. He enjoyed it free from any rent or service due to a superior, save of course public taxes and duties. But by the end of the eleventh century probably the larger part of the land

[1] The holders of small fiefs were not allowed to exercise the more important functions of sovereignty. Thus, of the estimated number of 70,000 fief holders in France in the tenth century, only between 100 and 200 possessed the right "to coin money, levy taxes, make laws, and administer their own justice."

in these same countries, as well as in other regions into which the feudal system had been carried, was held by a beneficiary or feudal tenure. We must now see how this great change came about.

The fief grew out of the *beneficium*, a form of estate well known among the Romans. When the barbarians overran the soil of the Empire, they appropriated, as we have seen, a good part of it to their own use. The king or leader of the invading tribe naturally had allotted to him a large share. Following his custom of bestowing gifts of arms and other articles upon his companions, he granted to his followers and friends parcels of his domains, upon the simple condition of faithfulness. At first these estates were bestowed only for life, and were called by the Latin name of *benefices;* but in the course of time they became hereditary, and then they began to be called *fiefs* or *feuds*. They took this latter name about the ninth century. As the royal lands were very extensive and were being constantly added to by inheritance and successful wars, these were a very important source of feudal estates.

Another and still more important source of fiefs was usurpation. Under the later Carolingians the counts, dukes, marquises, and other royal officers, who were at first simply appointed magistrates, succeeded, by taking advantage of the weakness of their sovereigns, in making their offices hereditary, and then in having their duchies, counties, and provinces regarded as fiefs granted to them by the king. By the year 877 this process had proceeded so far that in that year Charles the Bald of France recognized the hereditary character of the offices of his counts. In this way the countries originally embraced within the limits of the empire of Charlemagne became broken up into a considerable number of enormous fiefs, the heads of which, bearing the names of count, duke, marquis, and so on, became the great vassals of the crown.

Another way in which fiefs arose was through the owners of allodial estates voluntarily surrendering them into the hands of some powerful lord, and then receiving them back as benefices or fiefs. We shall see, a little further on, how the confusion and anarchy of the ninth and tenth centuries caused multitudes of allodial proprietors thus to turn their freeholds into fiefs, that

they might thereby come within the feudal system and enjoy its advantages and protection.

91. Origin of the Feudal Patronage. — We named the close personal tie uniting the lord and his vassal as the second of the essential features of the feudal system. Some have traced this to the Teutons, and think it the same tie as that which bound the companion to his chief and created the ancient German institution known as the *comitatus*. Others have pronounced it identical with the tie that at Rome bound the client to his patron. Still others have traced it to the Celtic or Gallic custom of commendation, whereby a person subjected himself to a more powerful lord for the sake of his patronage and protection. All these things indeed are very much alike, and any one might have served as the germ out of which feudal patronage, the special relation of lord and vassal, was developed.

The important thing to bear in mind, however, is that in the Frankish kingdom, which was the cradle of feudalism, we find all the officers of the court and the great men of the nation holding to the king relations of sworn fidelity and trust which were in various respects analogous to the relations that subsisted in earlier times between the German war leader and his companions.

Now, in time this peculiar personal relation, characterized on the part of the vassal by pledges of fealty, service, and aid, and on the part of the lord by promise of counsel and protection, came to be united with the benefice, with which at first it had nothing to do. The union of these two ties completed the feudal tenure.

92. Origin of the Feudal Sovereignty. — It still remains to speak of the feudal sovereignty. How did the possessor of a fief acquire the rights of a sovereign over the persons living upon it, — the right to administer justice, to coin money, and to wage war? How did these privileges and authorities which at first resided in the king come to be distributed among the fief holders? In two ways largely, — by the king's voluntary surrender of his rights and powers, and by usurpation.

Thus the Merovingian and Carolingian rulers very frequently conferred upon churches, monasteries, and important personages a

portion of the royal power. This was done by what were known as *grants of immunity*.[2] Thus a monastery, for instance, would, by such a grant, be freed from certain public charges and duties, and be given administrative and judicial authority over all classes of persons living upon its lands. In this way the royal authority was much scattered and weakened.

A still more important source of feudal sovereignty was the usurpation of the kingly power by the royal officers. Under the later Carolingians these magistrates, as we have already seen, succeeded in making their offices hereditary, and thus transformed themselves into petty sovereigns, only nominally dependent upon their king. They became powerful vassals, while their sovereign became a suzerain, a shadow king. By such usurpations the kingdoms into which the empire of Charlemagne was at first broken became still further subdivided into numerous petty feudal principalities, and the royal power was distributed down through the ranks of a more or less perfectly graded civil hierarchy.

FIG. 13. — THE CEREMONY OF HOMAGE. (From a seal of the twelfth century)

93. The Ceremony of Homage. — A fief was conferred by a very solemn and peculiar ceremony called *homage*. The person about to become a vassal, kneeling with uncovered head, placed his hands in those of his future lord and solemnly vowed to be henceforth his man[3] and to serve him faithfully even with his life. This part of the ceremony, sealed with a kiss, was what properly constituted the ceremony of homage. It was accompanied by an oath of fealty, and the whole was concluded by the

[2] A grant of immunity may for purposes of illustration be compared to the charter granted by the modern state to the board of directors of a college or other corporation, whereby are conferred upon this body limited rights of legislation and jurisdiction; or a better illustration perhaps would be the Constitution that the United States Government by its ratification gives to a territory and thereby makes it a State with many sovereign powers. Federalism indeed presents various instructive analogies to feudalism.

[3] Latin *homo*, whence "homage."

act of investiture, whereby the lord put his vassal in actual possession of the land or, by placing in his hand a clod of earth or a twig, symbolized the delivery to him of the estate for which he had just now done homage and sworn fealty.

94. The Relations of Lord and Vassal. — In general terms the duty of the vassal was service; that of the lord, protection. The most honorable service required of the vassal, and the one most willingly rendered in a martial age, was military aid. The liegeman must always be ready to follow his lord upon his military expeditions; but the time of service for one year was usually not more than forty days. He must defend his lord in battle; if he should be unhorsed, must give him his own animal; and, if he should be made a prisoner, must offer himself as a hostage for his release. He must also give entertainment to his lord and his retinue on their journeys. He was, moreover, under obligation, upon summons, to serve as juror or judge in the lord's court, and thus aid him in the settlement of disputes between his vassals.

There were other incidents mainly of a financial nature attaching to a fief, which grew up gradually and did not become a part of the system much before the eleventh century. These were known as *Reliefs*, *Fines upon Alienation*, *Escheats*, and *Aids*.

A Relief was the name given to the sum of money which an heir upon coming into possession of a fief must pay to the lord of the domain. This was often a large amount, being usually the entire revenue of the estate for one year.

A Fine upon Alienation was a sum of money paid to the lord by a vassal for permission to alienate his fief, that is, to substitute another vassal in his place.

By Escheat was meant the falling back of the fief into the hands of the lord through failure of heirs. If the fief lapsed through disloyalty or other misdemeanor on the part of the vassal, this was known as *Forfeiture*.

Aids were sums of money which the lord had a right to demand to enable him to meet unusual expenditures, especially for defraying the expense of knighting his eldest son, for providing a marriage dower for his eldest daughter, and for ransoming his own

person from captivity in case he were made a prisoner of war.[4] The chief return that the lord was bound to make to the vassal as a compensation for these various services and rights was justice and protection, — by no means a small return in an age of turmoil and insecurity.

95. **Serfs[5] and Serfdom.** — The vassals, or fief holders of various grades, constituted only a very small portion, perhaps five per cent or less, of the population of the countries where feudalism came to prevail. The great bulk of the folk were agricultural serfs.[6] These were the men who actually tilled the soil. Just how this servile class arose is not positively known. Some think that the ancestors of the mediæval serfs were bondsmen, others that they were, speaking generally, freemen. In some countries at least they seem to have been the lineal descendants of the slaves of Roman times, whose condition had been gradually ameliorated. Their status varied greatly from country to country and from period to period; that is to say, there came to be many grades of serfs filling the space between the actual slave and the full freeman. Consequently it is impossible to give any general account of the class which can be regarded as a true picture of their actual condition as a body at any given time. The following description must therefore be taken as reflecting their duties and disabilities only in the most general way.

The first and most characteristic feature of the condition of the serfs was that they were affixed to the soil. They could not

[4] The right of wardship was the right of the lord, when a successor to a fief was a minor, to assume the guardianship of the heir and to enjoy the revenues of the fief until his ward became of age. The right of marriage was the right of the lord to select a husband for his female ward, "lest he should get an enemy for a vassal."

[5] The terms *serf* and *villain*, although in some countries they denoted different classes, are used interchangeably by many writers. Thus English writers usually employ the terms *villains* and *villanage* in speaking of the servile English peasantry after the Norman Conquest. We shall, however, throughout our work use the words *serf* and *serfdom* only in the sense defined in the present paragraph.

[6] There were some free peasants and a larger number of free artisans and traders, inhabitants of the towns. The number of actual slaves was small. They had almost all disappeared before the end of the tenth century, either having been emancipated or been lifted into the lowest order of serfs, which was an advance toward freedom. At the time of the great Domesday survey (sec. 117) there were, according to this record, only about 25,000 slaves in England.



Photograph of an Open Field in Hitchin Manor

Showing the grassy balks, or unplowed furrows, which take the place of hedges and divide the acre and half-acre strips of the great open field

[1] This map is based on charts in Seebohm's *The English Village Community*, and illustrates the open-field system of cultivation of the mediæval manor. The thirty scattered strips colored red represent the normal holding of a villain (*villanus*); the strips colored blue, comprising about one third of the land of the manor, show the way in which the demesne of the lord was often made up of numerous tracts scattered about the open fields instead of forming a continuous tract around the manor house; the areas colored green represent the meadows and common pasture lands.

of their own will leave the estate or manor to which they belonged; nor, on the other hand, could their lord deprive them of their holdings and set them adrift. When the land changed masters they passed with it, just like a "rooted tree or stone earth-bound." It was this that constituted the peasants serfs in the sense in which we shall use the term.

Each serf had allotted him by his lord a cottage and a number of acres of land, — thirty acres formed a normal holding, — consisting of numerous narrow strips scattered about the great open fields of the manor. For these he paid a rent, usually during the earlier feudal times in kind and in personal services. The personal services included a certain number of days' work, usually two or three days each week, on the demesne, that is, the land which the lord had kept in his own hands as a sort of home farm. The nature of the work consisted in plowing the lord's land, tilling and weeding his crops, ditching, building walls, repairing roads and bridges, cutting and hauling wood to the manor house, washing and shearing sheep, feeding the hounds, and picking nuts and wild berries for the folk in the castle. Often the poor serf could find time to till his own little plot only on moonlit nights or on rainy days. He must furthermore grind his grain at his lord's mill, press his grapes at his wine press, bake his bread at his oven, often paying for these services an unreasonable toll.

After the serf had rendered to the lord all the rent in kind he owed for his cottage and bit of ground, the remainder of the produce from his fields was, in accordance with custom if not always with law, his own. Generally the share was only just sufficient to keep the wolf of hunger from his door. Some serfs, however, were able to accumulate considerable personal property, enough wherewith to purchase their freedom.

In some countries upon the death of the serf all that he had became in the eye of the law the property of his lord; in other lands, again, the lord could take only the best animal or the best implement of the deceased serf. This was called the *heriot.*

Besides all these payments, services, gifts, and dues, there were often others of a whimsical and teasing rather than an oppressive

nature. But of these we need not now speak. What we have already said will convey some idea of the nature of the relations that existed between the lord and his serf, and will indicate how servile and burdensome were the incidents of the tenure by which the serf held his cottage and bit of ground. How the serf gradually freed himself from the heavy yoke of his servitude and became a freeman will appear as we advance in our narrative.

96. **Development of the Feudal System.** — Although the germs of feudalism may be found in the society of the fifth or sixth century, still the system did not develop so as to exhibit its characteristic features before the eighth or ninth.

What greatly contributed to the development of feudalism, particularly on its military side, was the means adopted by Charles Martel, after the battle of Tours, to repel the continued raids of the Arab horsemen into Southern Gaul. Foot soldiers being useless in the pursuit of the mounted marauders, Charles created a cavalry force, appropriating for this purpose Church lands which he granted in fief to meet the cost of service on horseback. This was the opening of the day of feudal chivalry (sec. 102). Gradually the old general levies of foot soldiers were almost wholly superseded by arrays of feudal knights.

This development of feudalism as a defensive military system and in the typical form which it had now assumed in the Gallic border land between Saracen and Christian was hastened by the disturbed state of society everywhere during the greater part of the ninth and the tenth century; for after the death of Charlemagne and the partition of his empire among his feeble successors, it appeared as though the world were again falling back into chaos. The bonds of society seemed entirely broken. Every man did that which was right in his own eyes.

To internal disorders were added the invasions of the outside barbarians; for, no longer held in restraint by the strong arm of the great Charles, they had now begun their raids anew. From the north came the Scandinavian pirates to harry the shores of Germany, Gaul, and Britain. The terror which these pagan sea rovers inspired is commemorated by the supplication of the litany

of those days: "From the fury of the Northmen, good Lord, deliver us." From the east came the terrible Hungarians. These pagan marauders not only devastated Germany but troubled Southern France and, passing the Alps, spread before them a terror like that which had run before the Huns nearly five hundred years earlier.

By the way of the sea on the south came an equally dreaded foe. The Saracens, now intrenched in Spain and Sicily, made piratical descents upon all the Christian shores of the Western and Middle Mediterranean, sacking and burning, and creating here such panic and dismay as the Northmen and Hungarians were creating by their irruptions in the north and east.

It was this anarchical state of things that, as we have said, caused the rapid development of feudalism. All classes hastened to enter the system in order to secure the protection which it alone could afford. Kings, princes, and wealthy persons who had large landed possessions which they had never parceled out as fiefs, were now led to do so, that their estates might be held by tenants bound to protect them by all the sacred obligations of homage and fealty. Thus sovereigns and princes became suzerains and feudal lords. Again, the smaller proprietors who held their estates by allodial tenure voluntarily surrendered them into the hands of some neighboring lord, and then received them back again from him as fiefs, that they might claim protection as vassals. They deemed this better than being robbed of their property altogether.

Moreover, for like reasons and in like manner, churches, monasteries, and cities became members of the feudal system. They granted out their vast possessions as fiefs, and thus became suzerains and lords. Bishops and abbots became the heads of great bands of retainers, and often themselves led military expeditions like temporal chiefs. On the other hand, these same monasteries and towns frequently placed themselves under the protection of some powerful lord, and thus came in vassalage to him. Sometimes the bishops and the heads of religious houses, instead of paying military service, bound themselves to say a certain number of Masses for the lord or his family. Lewis the

Pious, son and successor of Charles the Great, decreed that with some exceptions all the monasteries of his domains should hold their estates on the sole condition "that they should pray for the welfare of the Emperor and his children and the Empire."

In this way were Church and State, all classes of society from the wealthiest suzerain to the humblest vassal, bound together by feudal ties. Everything was impressed with the stamp of feudalism.

97. Castles of the Nobles. — The lawless and violent character of the times during which feudalism prevailed is well shown by the nature of the residences which the great nobles built for



FIG. 14. — TYPICAL MEDIÆVAL CASTLE. (From an engraving)

themselves. These were strong stone fortresses, often perched upon some rocky eminence, and defended by moats and towers.

France, Germany, Italy, Northern Spain, England, and Scotland, in which countries the feudal system became most thoroughly developed, fairly bristled with these fortified residences of the nobility. Strong walls were the only protection against the universal violence of the age. Not only had each lord to protect himself against the attacks of neighboring chiefs, but also against those of foreign foes, such as the Hungarians and the Northmen; for there was no strong central authority to make law respected and to give protection to all.

One of the most striking and picturesque features of the landscape of many regions in Europe to-day is the ivy-mantled towers and walls of these feudal castles, now falling into ruins. They are impressive memorials of an age that has passed away.

98. **Sports of the Nobles; Hunting and Hawking.** — When not engaged in military enterprises, the nobles occupied much of their time in hunting and hawking. "With the northern barbarians," writes Hallam, "it [hunting] was rather a predominant appetite than an amusement; it was their pride and their ornament, the theme of their songs, the object of their laws, and the business of their lives." It was the forest laws of the Norman conquerors of England, designed for the protection of the game in the royal preserves, which, perhaps more than anything else, caused these foreign rulers to be so hated by the English (sec. 118).

Abbots and bishops entered upon the chase with as great zest as the lay nobles. Even the prohibitions of Church councils against the clergy's indulging in such worldly amusements were wholly ineffectual.

Hawking grew into a very passion among all classes, even ladies participating in the sport. In the celebrated tapestries and upon all the monuments of the feudal age, the greyhound and the falcon, the dog lying at the feet of his master and the bird perched upon his wrist, are, after the knightly sword and armor, the most common emblems of nobility.

99. **Causes of the Decay of Feudalism.** — Chief among the various causes which undermined and at length overthrew feudalism were the hostility of the kings and the common people to the system, the Crusades, the growth of the cities, and the introduction of firearms in the art of war.

The feudal system was hated and opposed by both the royal power and the people. In fact it was never regarded with much favor by any class save the nobles, who enjoyed its advantages at the expense of all the other orders of society. Kings opposed it and sought to break it down, because it left them only the semblance of power. We shall see later how the kings came again to their own (Chapter XVII).

The common people always hated it for the reason that under it they were regarded as of less value than the game in the lord's hunting park. The record of their struggles for recognition in society and a participation in the privileges of the haughty feudal aristocracy forms the most interesting and instructive portions of mediæval and even of later history.

The Crusades, or Holy Wars, that agitated all Europe during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries did much to weaken the power of the nobles; for in order to raise money for their expeditions they frequently sold or mortgaged their estates, and in this way power and influence passed into the hands of the kings or the wealthy merchants of the cities. Many of the great nobles also perished in battle with the infidels, and their lands escheated to their suzerain, whose domains were thus augmented.

The growth of the towns also tended to the same end. As they increased in wealth and influence, they became able to resist the exactions and tyranny of the lord in whose fief they happened to be, and eventually were able to secede, as it were, from his authority, and to make of themselves little republics.

Again, improvements and changes in the mode of warfare, especially those resulting from the use of gunpowder, hastened the downfall of feudalism by rendering the yeoman foot soldier equal to the armor-clad knight. "It made all men of the same height," as Carlyle puts it. The people with muskets in their hands could assert and make good their rights. And the castle, the body of feudalism, that in which it lived and moved and had its being, now became a useless thing. Its walls might bid defiance to the mounted, steel-clad baron and his retainers, but they could offer little protection against well-trained artillery.

But it is to be carefully noted that, though feudalism as a system of government disappeared, speaking broadly, with the Middle Ages,[7] it still continued to exist as a social organization.

[7] Different events and circumstances marked the decline and extinction of feudalism in the various countries of Europe (Chapter XVII). In England it was the contention for the crown, known as the Wars of the Roses (1455–1485), in which many of the nobility were killed or ruined in estate, that gave the deathblow to the institution there. The ruin of the system in France may be dated from the

The nobles lost their power and authority as petty sovereigns, but retained their titles, their privileges, their social distinction, and, in many cases, their vast landed estates.

100. **Defects of the Feudal System.** — Feudalism was perhaps the best form of social organization that it was possible to maintain in Europe during the mediæval period; yet it had many and serious defects. Among its chief faults may be pointed out the two following.

First, it rendered impossible the formation of strong national governments. Every country was divided and subdivided into a vast number of practically independent principalities. Thus in the tenth century France was partitioned among about a hundred and fifty overlords, all exercising equal and coördinate powers of sovereignty. The enormous estates of these great lords were again subdivided into about seventy thousand smaller fiefs.

In theory, as we have seen, the holders of these petty estates were bound to serve and obey their overlords, and these great nobles were in turn the sworn vassals of the French king. But many of these lords were richer and stronger than the king himself, and if they chose to cast off their allegiance to him, he found it impossible to reduce them to obedience. The king's time was chiefly occupied in ineffectual efforts to reduce his haughty and refractory nobles to proper submission, and in intervening feebly to compose their endless quarrels with one another. It is easy to conceive the disorder and wretchedness produced by this state of things.

A second evil of the institution was its exclusiveness. Under the workings of the system society became divided into classes separated by lines which, though not impassable, were yet very rigid, with a proud hereditary aristocracy at its head. It was only as the lower classes in the different countries gradually wrested from the feudal nobility their special and unfair privileges that a better, because more democratic, form of society arose, and civilization began to make more rapid progress.

establishment of a regular standing army by Charles VII (in 1448). The rubbish of the institution, however, was not cleared away in that country until the great Revolution of 1789. In Spain the feudal aristocracy received its deathblow at the hands of Ferdinand and Isabella, in the latter part of the fifteenth century.

101. The Good Results of Feudalism. — The most conspicuous service that feudalism rendered European civilization was the protection which it gave to society after the break-up of the empire of Charles the Great. "It was the mailed feudal horseman and the impregnable walls of the feudal castle that foiled the attacks of the Danes, the Saracens, and the Hungarians" (Oman).

Feudalism rendered another noteworthy service to society in fostering among its privileged members self-reliance and love of personal independence. Turbulent, violent, and refractory as was the feudal aristocracy of Europe, it performed the grand service of keeping alive during the later mediæval period the spirit of liberty. The feudal lords would not allow themselves to be dealt with arrogantly by their king; they stood on their rights as freemen. Hence royalty was prevented from becoming as despotic as would otherwise have been the case. Thus in England, for instance, the feudal lords held such tyrannical rulers as King John in check (sec. 210), until such time as the yeoman and the burgher were bold enough and strong enough alone to resist their despotically inclined sovereigns. In France, where, unfortunately, the power of the feudal nobles was broken too soon, — before the burghers, the Third Estate, were prepared to take up the struggle for liberty, — the result was the growth of that

FIG. 15. — GROUP IN THE MANOR HOUSE. (From a tapestry of the fourteenth century; after *Green*)

autocratic, despotic royalty which led the French people to the Revolution and the Reign of Terror.

Another of the good effects of feudalism was the impulse it gave to certain forms of polite literature. Just as learning and philosophy were fostered by the seclusion of the cloister, so were poetry and romance fostered by the open and joyous hospitalities of the baronial hall. The castle door was always open to the wandering singer and story-teller, and it was amidst the scenes of festivity within that the ballads and romances of mediæval minstrelsy and literature had their birth. "It is to the feudal times," says Guizot, "that we trace back the earliest literary monuments of England, France, and Germany, the earliest intellectual enjoyments of modern Europe."

Still another service which feudalism rendered to civilization was the development within the baronial castle of those ideas and sentiments — among others a nice sense of honor and an exalted consideration for woman — which found their noblest expression in chivalry, of which institution and its good effects upon the social life of Europe we shall now proceed to speak.

II. Chivalry

102. Chivalry defined; Origin of the Institution. — Chivalry has been aptly defined as the "Flower of Feudalism." It was a military institution or order, the members of which, called knights, were pledged to the protection of the Church and to the defense of the weak and the oppressed.

The germ out of which chivalry developed seems to have been the body of vassal horsemen which Charles Martel created to repel the raids of the Saracens into Aquitaine[8] (sec. 96). It was in these border wars that the Franks learned from the Arab Moors "to put their trust in horses." From South France this new military system, in which mounted armor-clad warriors largely

[8] See Brunner, "Der Reiterdienst und die Anfänge des Lehnwesens" in his *Forschungen zur Geschichte des deutschen und französischen Rechtes* (Stuttgart, 1894). This important study is of the nature of a discovery respecting the beginnings, or rather the development, of the fief system and of chivalry.

superseded the earlier foot soldiers, spread over Europe. The development was closely connected with that of feudalism; indeed, it was the military side of that development. It became the rule that all fief holders must render military service on horseback. Fighting on horseback gradually became the normal mode and for centuries remained so.

Gradually this feudal warrior caste underwent a transformation. It became in part independent of the feudal system, in so far as that had to do with the land, so that any person, if qualified by birth and properly initiated, might be a member of the order without being the holder of a fief. A great part of the later knights were portionless sons of the nobility.

At the same time the religious spirit of the period entered into the order, and it became a Christian brotherhood, somewhat like the order of the priesthood. Thus, like all other mediæval institutions, chivalry resulted from a union of various elements. Its military forms, spirit, and virtues came from the side of feudalism; its religious forms, spirit, and virtues, from the side of the Church. What actually took place is best illustrated by those military orders of monks, the Knights Templars and Knights Hospitalers (sec. 143), which came into existence during the Crusades. But notwithstanding their monastic vows of celibacy and poverty, we probably shall not be wrong if we regard these monk-knights as the virtual descendants of those warriors to whom Charles Martel gave fiefs and whom he put on horses to repel the plundering incursions of the "swift Moors."

103. Its Universality; the Church and Chivalry. — As France was the cradle, so was it the true home, of chivalry. Yet its influence was felt everywhere and in everything. It colored all the events and enterprises of the latter half of the Middle Ages. The literature of the period is instinct with its spirit. The Crusades, the greatest undertakings of the mediæval ages, were primarily enterprises of the Christian chivalry of Europe; for chivalry had then come under the tutelage of the Church. In the year 1095 the Council of Clermont, which assembly formally inaugurated the First Crusade, decreed that every person of noble

birth, on attaining the age of twelve, should take a solemn oath before a bishop "that he would defend to the uttermost the oppressed, the widow, and the orphan; and that women of noble birth should enjoy his special care."

104. Training of the Knight. — When chivalry had once become established, all the sons of the nobility, save such as were to enter the holy orders of the Church, were set apart and disciplined for its service. The sons of the poorer nobles were usually placed in the family of some lord of renown and wealth, whose castle became a sort of school, where they were trained in the duties and exercises of knighthood.

This education began at the early age of seven, the youth bearing the name of page or varlet until he attained the age of fourteen, when he acquired the title of squire, or esquire. The lord and his knights trained the boys in manly and martial duties, while the ladies of the castle instructed them in the duties of religion and in all knightly etiquette. The duties of the page were usually confined to the castle, though sometimes he accompanied his lord to the field. The esquire always attended in battle the knight to whom he was attached, carrying his arms and, if need be, engaging in the fight.

FIG. 16. — ARMING A KNIGHT. (From a manuscript of the thirteenth century; after *Lacroix*)

105. The Ceremony of Knighting. — At the age of twenty-one the squire became a knight, being then introduced to the order of knighthood by a peculiar and impressive service. After a long fast and vigil the candidate listened to a lengthy sermon on his duties as a knight. Then kneeling, as in the feudal ceremony of homage, before the lord conducting the services, he vowed to defend religion and the ladies, to

succor the distressed, and ever to be faithful to his companion knights. His arms were now given to him, and his sword was girded on, when the lord, striking him with the flat of his sword on the shoulders, said, "In the name of God, of St. Michael, and of St. George, I dub thee knight; be brave, bold, and loyal."

106. The Tournament. — The tournament was the favorite amusement of the age of chivalry. It was a mimic battle between two companies of noble knights, armed usually with pointless swords or blunted lances. In the universal esteem in which the participants were held, it reminds us of the sacred games of the



FIG. 17. — A TILTING MATCH BETWEEN TWO KNIGHTS. (From an engraving)

Greeks; while in the fierce and sanguinary character it sometimes assumed, it recalls the gladiatorial combats of the Roman amphitheater.

The prince or baron giving the festival made wide proclamation of the event, brave and distinguished knights being invited even from distant lands to grace the occasion with their presence and an exhibition of their skill and prowess. The lists — a level space marked off by a rope or railing, and surrounded with

galleries for spectators — were made gay with banners and tapestries and heraldic emblems.

When the moment arrived for the opening of the ceremony, heralds proclaimed the rules of the contest, whereupon the combatants advanced into the lists, each knight displaying upon his helmet or breast the device of the mistress of his affections. At the given signal the opposing parties of knights, with couched lances, rode fiercely at each other. Victory was accorded to him who unhorsed his antagonist or broke in a proper manner the greatest number of lances. The guerdon of the victor was a wreath of flowers, armor, greyhounds, or steeds decked with knightly trappings, and, more esteemed than all else, the praises and favor of his lady-love.

Fig. 18. — Degradation of a Knight. (Fragment of a woodcut dated 1565; after *Lacroix*)

The joust differed from the tournament in being an encounter between two knights only, and in being attended with less ceremony.

107. Character of the Knight. — Chivalric loyalty to the mistress of his supreme affection was the first article in the creed of the true knight. "He who was faithful and true to his lady," says Hallam, "was held sure of salvation in the theology of castles, though not of Christians." He must also be gentle, brave, courteous, truthful, pure, generous, hospitable, faithful to his engagements, and ever ready to risk life

and limb in the cause of religion and in defense of his companions in arms.

But these were the virtues and qualifications of the ideal knight. It is needless to say that, though there were many who illustrated all these virtues in their blameless lives and romantic enterprises, there were too many who were knights only in profession. "An errant knight," as an old writer puns, with too much truth, "was an arrant knave." Another writer says, "Deeds that would disgrace a thief, and acts of cruelty that would have disgusted a Hellenic tyrant or a Roman emperor, were common things with knights of the highest lineage."

But cruelty, treachery, untruthfulness, cowardice, baseness, and crime of every sort were opposed to the true spirit of chivalry; and the knight who was convicted of such faults could be punished by expulsion from the order of knighthood, by what was known as the Ceremony of Degradation. In this ceremony the spurs of the offending knight were struck off from his heels with a heavy cleaver, his sword was broken, and his horse's tail cut off. Then the disgraced knight was dressed in a burial robe, and the usual funeral ceremonies were performed over him, signifying that he was "dead to the honors of knighthood."

108. Decline of Chivalry. — The fifteenth century was the evening of chivalry. The decline of the system resulted from the operation of the same causes that effected the overthrow of feudalism. The changes in the mode of warfare which helped to do away with the feudal baron and his mail-clad retainers likewise tended to destroy knight-errantry. And then as civilization advanced, new feelings and sentiments began to claim the attention and to work upon the imagination of men. Persons ambitious of distinction began to seek it in other ways than by adventures of chivalry. Governments, too, became more regular, and the increased order and security of society rendered less needful the services of the gallant knight in behalf of the weak and the oppressed.

In a word, the extravagant performances of the knight-errant carried into a practical and commercial age — an age very different from that which gave birth to chivalry — became fantastic and

ridiculous; and when, finally, early in the seventeenth century, the genial Spanish satirist Cervantes wrote his famous *Don Quixote*, in which work he leads his hero knight into all sorts of absurd adventures, such as running a tilt against a windmill, which his excited imagination had pictured to be a monstrous giant flourishing his arms with some wicked intent, everybody, struck with the infinite absurdity of the thing, fell a-laughing; and amidst the fitting accompaniment of smiles and broad pleasantries the knight-errant took his departure from the world.[9]

109. The Evil and the Good in Chivalry. — The system of chivalry had many vices, chief among which were its aristocratic, exclusive tendencies. Dr. Arnold, indignant among other things at the knights' forgetfulness or disregard of the brotherhood of man, exclaims bitterly, "If I were called upon to name what spirit of evil predominantly deserved the name of Antichrist, I should name the Spirit of Chivalry." And another indignant writer declares that "it is not probable that the knights supposed they could be guilty of injustice to the lower classes." These were regarded with indifference or contempt, and considered as destitute of any claims upon those of noble birth as were beasts of burden or the game of the chase. It is always the young and beautiful woman of *gentle* birth whose wrongs the valiant knight is risking his life to avenge, always the smiles of the queen of love and beauty for which he is splintering his lance in the fierce tournament. The fostering of this aristocratic spirit was one of the most serious faults of chivalry. Yet we must bear in mind that this fault should be charged to the age rather than to the knight.

But to speak of the beneficial, refining influences of chivalry, we should say that it undoubtedly contributed powerfully to lift that sentiment of respect for the gentler sex which characterized all the northern nations, into that tender veneration of woman which forms the distinguishing characteristic of the present age, and makes it differ from all preceding phases of civilization.

[9] That is, from the world of romantic literature; for the satire of Cervantes was aimed at the extravagances of the romancers of his times. (Recall Spenser's *The Faery Queene*.) There were not many *real* knights-errant when Cervantes wrote.

Again, chivalry did much to create that ideal of character — an ideal distinguished by the virtues of courtesy, gentleness, humanity, loyalty, magnanimity, and fidelity to the plighted word — which we rightly think to surpass any ever formed under the influences of antiquity. Just as Christianity gave to the world an ideal manhood which it was to strive to realize, so did chivalry hold up an ideal to which men were to conform their lives. Men, indeed, have never perfectly realized either the ideal of Christianity or that of chivalry; but the influence which these two ideals have had in shaping and giving character to the lives of men cannot be overestimated. Together, through the enthusiasm and effort awakened for their realization, they have produced a new type of manhood, which we indicate by the phrase "a knightly and Christian character."

Selections from the Sources. — *Translations and Reprints*, vol. iii, No. 5, "English Manorial Documents," and vol. iv, No. 3, "Documents Illustrative of Feudalism" (both ed. by Edward P. Cheyney). ROBINSON, *Readings in European History*, vol. i, chap. ix.

Secondary Works. — EMERTON, *Introduction to the Middle Ages*, chap. xv; and *Mediæval Europe*, chap. xiv and the first part of chap. xv. ADAMS, *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. ix. SEIGNOBOS, *The Feudal Régime*. BÉMONT and MONOD, *Mediæval Europe*, chap. xvi. SEEBOHM, *The English Village Community*. This is the most noteworthy work in our language on the subject with which it deals. The author seeks the origin of the English manor in the Roman villa with its servile population, thus making English history begin with servitude and not with freedom. CHEYNEY, *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England*, chap. ii, "Rural Life and Organization." MUNRO and SELLERY, *Mediæval Civilization*, pp. 159–211 and 240–247. CUTTS, *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages*, pp. 311–460, "Knights of the Middle Ages." LACROIX, *Military and Religious Life*. Consult Table of Contents. JAMES, *History of Chivalry*. CORNISH, *Chivalry*.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Life of the serfs on a mediæval manor. 2. The open-field system of cultivation. See *Seebohm*. 3. Description of a feudal castle. 4. Life in the castle. 5. A tournament. 6. Legend of the Holy Grail.

FIG. 19. — LANDING IN ENGLAND OF WILLIAM OF NORMANDY
(From the Bayeux tapestry)

CHAPTER X

THE NORMANS

I. THE NORMANS AT HOME AND IN ITALY

110. Introductory. — The history of the Normans — the name, it will be recalled, of the transformed Scandinavians who settled in Northern Gaul (sec. 86) — is simply a continuation of the story of the Northmen; and nothing could better illustrate the difference between the period we have left behind and the one upon which we have entered, nothing could more strikingly exhibit the gradual transformation that has crept over the face and spirit of European society, than the transformation which time and favoring associations have wrought in these men. When first we met them in the ninth century they were pagans; now they are Christians. Then they were rough, wild, merciless corsairs; now they are become the most cultured, polished, and chivalrous people in Europe. But the restless, daring spirit that drove the Norse sea kings forth upon the waves in quest of adventure and booty still stirs in the breasts of their descendants. As has been said, they were simply changed from heathen Vikings, delighting in the wild life of sea rover and pirate, into Christian knights, eager for pilgrimages and crusades.

It is these men, uniting in their character the strength, independence, and daring of the Scandinavian with the vivacity, imagination, and culture of the Romano-Gaul, that we are now

to follow, as from their seats in France they go forth to make fresh conquests, — to build up a kingdom in the Mediterranean lands, and to set a line of Norman kings upon the English throne. Later, in following the fortunes of the crusaders, we shall meet them on the battlefields of Palestine, there winning renown as the most valiant knights of Christendom.

111. **The Dukes of Normandy.** — Under Rollo (sec. 86) and his immediate successors — William Longsword (927–943), Richard the Fearless (943–996), and Richard the Good (996–1027) — the power of the Normans in France became gradually consolidated. The country of Normandy grew more populous, both through the natural increase of the population at home and the arrival of fresh bands of Scandinavians from the Northern countries. Finally, after more than one hundred years had passed, years for the most part of uneventful yet steady growth and development, the old Norse spirit of adventure revived, and Southern Europe and England became the scene of the daring and brilliant exploits of the Norman warriors.

112. **The Normans in Italy and Sicily.** — The Normans secured a foothold in Southern Italy in the early part of the eleventh century, some little time before the conquest of England. Their superior fighting qualities had led to their services being sought after by the Christian rulers of that region in their constant feuds with each other, and particularly in their warfare against the Moslems, who at that time were in possession of the island of Sicily, and were constantly troubling the neighboring shores of Italy.

From the position of guests and mercenaries the Norman knights soon rose to that of masters and rulers. They got possession finally of all Southern Italy and of Sicily, and built up in these southern lands a prosperous state, which came to be known as the Kingdom of Naples or the Kingdom of Naples and Sicily, and which lasted, although with many changes of dynasties, until the political unification of Italy in our own day.

The most celebrated of the Norman leaders during this period of conquest and organization was Robert Guiscard (d. 1085), a character only less celebrated than the renowned William the

Conqueror, of whom we shall come to speak presently. His entire career was one series of daring and adventurous exploits, which spread the renown of the Norman name throughout the Mediterranean lands.

One of the most important consequences of the creation of this new Norman state in the south was its effect upon the Crusades, to the eve of which we have now come. These Norman rulers built up a strong maritime power, which had the great port of Amalfi as its center, and, with the help of the fleets of Genoa, Pisa, and Venice, cleared the Middle Mediterranean of Saracen corsairs, thus opening up for the coming crusaders a water route to the Holy Land.

II. The Norman Conquest of England

113. Events leading up to the Conquest.—The conquest of England by the Normans was the most important of their enterprises, and one followed by consequences of the greatest magnitude, not only to the conquered people, but indirectly to the world.

In the year 1035 the duke of the Normans, known as Robert the Magnificent (1027–1035), died in Asia Minor, while on his way home from a romantic pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and his son William, the destined conqueror of England, became Duke of Normandy. William was at this time only seven years of age. The cruelty with which he, while yet a mere boy, punished those of his enemies that had especially awakened his resentment indicated the stern and unrelenting character of the man whom destiny had selected to play a most important part in the history of the eleventh century.

The situation of affairs in England at this time was this. In the year 1066 Edward the Confessor, in whose person, it will be recalled, the old English line was restored after the Danish usurpation (sec. 85), died, and immediately the Witan,[1] in accordance

[1] The Witan, or Witenagemot, which means the "Meeting of the Wise Men," was the common council of the realm. The House of Lords of the present Parliament is a survival of this early national assembly.

with the dying wish of the king, chose Harold, Earl of Wessex, the best and strongest man in all England, to be his successor.

When the news of the action of the Witan and of Harold's acceptance of the English crown was carried across the Channel to William, he was really or feignedly transported with rage. He declared that Edward, who was his cousin, had during his lifetime promised the throne to him, and that Harold had assented to this, and by solemn oath engaged to sustain him. He now demanded of Harold that he surrender to him the usurped throne, threatening the immediate invasion of the island in case he refused. King Harold answered the demand by expelling from the country the Normans who had followed Edward into the kingdom, and by collecting an army for the defense of his dominions. Duke William now made ready for a descent upon the English coast.

114. The Battle of Hastings (1066). — The Norman army of invasion landed in the south of England, at the port of Hastings, which place gave name to the battle that almost immediately followed, — the battle that was to determine the fate of England. It was begun by a horseman riding out from the Norman lines

FIG. 20. — BATTLE OF HASTINGS. (From the Bayeux tapestry)

and advancing alone toward the English army, tossing up his sword and skillfully catching it as it fell, and singing all the while the stirring battle song of Charlemagne and Roland. The English watched with astonishment this exhibition of "careless dexterity," and if they did not contrast the vivacity and nimbleness of the Norman foe with their own heavy and clumsy manners, others at least have not failed to do so for them.

The battle once joined, the conflict was long and terrific. The day finally went against the English. Harold fell, pierced through the eye by an arrow; and William was master of the field (1066).

115. **The Completion of the Conquest** (1067–1070). — William now marched upon London, and at Westminster, on Christmas Day, 1066, was crowned and anointed king of England; but he was yet far from being such in fact. The most formidable resistance made to the Conqueror was in the north, where the population was composed chiefly of Danes, who were aided by their kinsmen from Denmark. To protect himself on this side, William finally ravaged all the country between the Humber and the Tees, converting it into an uninhabitable desert. More than a quarter of a century afterwards the desolated district was marked by untilled fields and the charred ruins of hamlets and towns. One hundred thousand people, deprived of food and shelter, perished miserably during the unusually severe winter following the cruel act.

116. **The Distribution of the Land and the Gemot of Salisbury.** — Almost the first act of William after he had established his power in England was to fulfill his promise to the nobles who had aided him in his enterprise, by distributing among them the unredeemed[2] estates of the English who had fought at Hastings in defense of their king and country.

Profiting by the lesson taught by the wretched condition of France, which country was kept in a state of constant turmoil by a host of feudal chiefs and lords, many of whom were almost or quite as powerful as the king himself (sec. 100), William took care that in the distribution no feudatory should receive an entire shire, save in two or three exceptional cases. To the great lord to whom he must needs give a large fief, he granted not a continuous tract of land, but several estates or manors scattered in different parts

2 "When the lands of all those who had fought for Harold were confiscated, those who were willing to acknowledge William were allowed to redeem theirs, either paying money at once or giving hostages for the payment" (Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, vol. i, p. 258). As many as 20,000 Saxon proprietors in all are said to have been dispossessed by as many Norman followers of William.

of the country, in order that there might be no dangerous concentration of property or power in the hands of the vassal.

Another equally important limitation of the power of the vassal was effected by William through his requiring all fief holders, great and small, to take an oath of fealty directly to him as overlord. This was a great innovation upon feudal custom, for the rule was that the vassal should swear fealty to his own immediate lord only, and in war follow his banner even against his own king. The oath that William exacted from every fief holder made the allegiance which he owed to his king superior to that which he owed to his own immediate lord. At the great gemot or military assembly of Salisbury in the year 1086 "all the landholders of substance in England" swore to William this solemn oath of superior fealty and allegiance.

William also denied to his feudatories the right of coining money and making laws; and by other wise restrictions upon their power, subordinating, for instance, all the baronial courts to the jurisdiction of the royal judges, he saved England from those endless contentions and petty wars that were distracting almost every other country of Europe.

To overawe the dispossessed people, William now built and garrisoned fortresses or towers in all the principal cities of the realm. The celebrated Tower of London and the great black, massive tower still standing in the city of Newcastle were built by him, and are impressive memorials of the days of the Conquest. His nobles also erected strong castles upon their lands, so that the whole country fairly bristled with these fortified private residences. With the towns dominated by the great fortresses, and the open country watched over by the barons secure in their thick-walled castles, the Normans, though vastly inferior in numbers to the conquered Saxons, were able to hold them in perfect subjection.

117. **Domesday Book.** — One of the most celebrated acts of the Conqueror was the making of Domesday Book. This famous book contained a description and valuation of all the lands of England, — excepting those of some counties, mostly in the north, that were either unconquered or unsettled; an enumeration of

the cattle and sheep; and statements of the income of every man. It was intended, in a word, to be a perfect survey and census of the entire kingdom.

The commissioners who went through the land to collect the needed information for the work were often threatened by the people, who resented this "prying into their affairs," and looked upon the whole thing as simply another move preparatory to fresh taxation. But notwithstanding the bitter feelings with which the English viewed the preparation of the work, it was certainly a wise and necessary measure, and one prompted by statesmanlike motives.



FIG. 21. — DOMESDAY BOOK. (From a facsimile edition published by royal command in 1862)

There are two large volumes of the survey, one being a folio of 760 pages and the other a large octavo of 900 pages. The strong box shown in the cut is the chest in which the volumes were formerly kept

118. The Curfew and the Forest Laws. — Among the regulations introduced into England by the Conqueror was the peculiar one known as the Curfew bell. This law required that, upon the ringing of the church bell at nightfall, every person should be at home, and that the fires should be buried [8] and the lights extinguished.

Two reasons have been assigned for this ordinance: the one supposes that its object was to prevent the people's assembling by night to plan or execute treasonable undertakings; the other represents it simply as a safeguard against fire. The law was certainly in force in Normandy before the Conquest; indeed, according to Palgrave, it was a universal custom of police throughout the whole of mediæval Europe.

[8] Hence the term Curfew, from *couvrir*, to cover, and *feu*, fire.

Less justifiable and infinitely more odious to the people were the Forest Laws of the Normans. The Normans were excessively fond of the chase. William had for the sport a perfect passion. An old chronicler declares that "he loved the tall deer as if he were their father." Extensive tracts of country were turned into forests by the destruction of the farmhouses and villages. More than fifty hamlets, and numerous churches, are said to have been destroyed in the creation of what was known as the New Forest.[4]

The game in these forests was protected by severe laws. To kill a deer was a greater crime than to kill a man. Several members of the Conqueror's family were killed while hunting in these royal preserves, and the people declared that these misfortunes were the judgment of Heaven upon the cruelty of their founder.

119. **The Norman Successors of the Conqueror** (1087–1154). — For nearly three quarters of a century after the death of William the Conqueror, England was ruled by Norman kings. Three names span this long period, — William II, known as Rufus, or the Red (1087–1100); Henry I, surnamed Beauclerc, or the "good scholar" (1100–1135); and Stephen of Blois (1135–1154), a grandson of the Conqueror.

Notwithstanding the many oppressive laws and cruel acts that marked the reigns of the sons of the great duke, — William and Henry, — England flourished under their rule; commerce and the various industries were steadily progressing, and the Normans and the English, forgetting their mutual enmities, were gradually blending into a single people.

But upon the death of Henry a dispute as to the succession arose between his daughter Matilda and Stephen of Blois. For several years the realm was wasted by civil war. Eventually a covenant was made between the contending parties whereby it was agreed that Stephen should hold the crown undisturbed during his life, but that at his death it should go to the son of Matilda. The year following this arrangement Stephen died, and the crown

[4] The term forest as applied to these hunting parks does not necessarily mean a continuous wooded tract, but simply untilled ground left to grow up to weeds and shrubs as a covert for game.

was placed, according to the treaty, upon the head of Henry of Anjou, who thus became the founder of the dynasty of the Angevins, or Plantagenets (1154).

120. Results of the Norman Conquest. — The most important and noteworthy result of the Conquest was the establishment in England of a strong centralized government. This came about not only through the monarchical views of government brought in by the Norman kings and the modification of feudal rules and practices effected by the Conqueror, but also through the wholesome lessons impressed upon the minds of the people by the intolerable anarchy of Stephen's reign. England now became a real kingdom, — what it had hardly been in more than semblance before.

A second result of the Conquest was the founding of a new feudal aristocracy. The Saxon thane was displaced by the Norman baron. This not only introduced a new and more refined element into the social life of England, but it also changed the membership, the temper, and the name of the national assembly, the old English Witan now becoming the Parliament of later times.

A third result of the Conquest was the drawing of England into closer relations with the countries of continental Europe. The Norman Conquest was in this respect like the Roman conquest of the island. Through the many continental relations — political, social, commercial, and ecclesiastical — now established or made more intimate, England's advance in trade, in architecture, in her religious and intellectual life, was greatly promoted. And in this connection must be borne in mind particularly the close political and feudal relations into which England was brought with France, for out of these grew the jealousies and rivalries which led to the long Hundred Years' War between the two countries.[5]

Selections from the Sources. — *The Bayeux Tapestry.* (Reproduced in autotype plates with historic notes by Frank Rede Fowke, London, 1875.) This is a strip of linen canvas over two hundred feet long and nineteen inches wide, upon which are embroidered in colors seventy-two pictures,

[5] For the effects of the Conquest upon the English language and literature, see secs. 226 and 227.

representing episodes in the Norman conquest of England. The work was executed not long after the events it depicts, and is named from the cathedral in France where it is kept. Its importance consists in the information it conveys respecting the life and manners, and the costumes, arms, and armor of the times. LEE, *Source-Book*, pp. 111–129. KENDALL, *Source-Book*, chap. iii, "Norman England."

Secondary Works. — FREEMAN, *The Norman Conquest.* This is a little book which contains "the same tale told afresh," that fills the six volumes of the author's earlier great work on the Norman Conquest. Also by the same author, *William the Conqueror.* JOHNSON, *The Normans in Europe.* CREASY, *Decisive Battles of the World*, chap. vii, "The Battle of Hastings, A.D. 1066." GREEN, *The Conquest of England*, chap. x. JEWETT, *The Story of the Normans*, chap. vii, "The Normans in Italy." For life, culture, and manners: TRAILL, *Social England*, vol. i, chap. iii; and BATESON, *Mediæval England.*

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Robert Guiscard. 2. The Bayeux tapestry. 3. Domesday Book. 4. The Curfew. 5. The "forests" and forest laws of the Norman kings.

CHAPTER XI

THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE

121. The Two World Powers. — "The two great ideas," says James Bryce, "which expiring antiquity bequeathed to the ages that followed were those of a world monarchy and a world religion." We have seen how out of one of these ideas, under the favoring circumstances of the earlier mediæval centuries, was developed the Empire, and out of the other the Papacy. The history of these two powers, of their relations to the rulers and the peoples of Europe, and of their struggle with each other for supremacy, makes up a large part of the history of the mediæval centuries. It is of these important matters that we must now try to get some sort of understanding.

What we have learned about the ideas and principles of feudalism will aid us greatly in our study, for, as we shall see, the whole long struggle between these two world powers was deeply marked by feudal conceptions and practices.

122. The Three Theories respecting the Relations of Pope and Emperor. — After the revival of the Empire in the West and the rise of the Papacy, there gradually grew up three different theories in regard to the divinely constituted relation of the "world king" and the "world priest." The first was that Pope and Emperor were each independently commissioned by God, the first to rule the spirits of men, the second to rule their bodies. Each reigning thus by original divine right, neither is set above the other, but both are to coöperate and to help each other. The special duty of the temporal power is to maintain order in the world and to be the protector of the Church. The Emperor bears the sword for the purpose of executing the decrees of the Church against all heretics and disturbers of its peace and unity. Thus

this theory looked to a perfect and beautiful alliance between Church and State, a double sovereignty emblemized in the dual nature of Christ.

The second theory, the one held by the imperial party, was that the Emperor was superior to the Pope in secular affairs. Arguments from Scripture and from the transactions of history were not wanting to support this view of the relation of the two world powers. Thus Christ's payment of tribute money was cited as proof that he regarded the temporal power as superior to the spiritual. And then, did he not say, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's"? Further, the gifts of Pippin and Charles the Great to the Roman see made the popes, it was maintained, the vassals of the emperors.

FIG. 22. — THE SPIRITUAL AND THE TEMPORAL POWER. (From a ninth-century mosaic in the Lateran at Rome; after Jaeger, *Weltgeschichte*)

St. Peter gives to Pope Leo III the stola and to Charlemagne the banner of Rome as symbols of the spiritual and temporal power. The portrait of Charlemagne here shown is with little doubt the oldest in existence

The third theory, the one held by the papal party, maintained that the ordained relation of the two powers was the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual authority, even in civil affairs. This view was maintained by such texts of Scripture as these: "But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man";[1] "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant."[2] The conception was further illustrated by such comparisons as the following, — for in mediæval times parable and metaphor often took the place of argument: As God has set in the heavens two lights,

[1] 1 Corinthians ii. 15. [2] Jeremiah i. 10.

the sun and the moon, so has he established on earth two powers, the spiritual and the temporal; but as the moon is inferior to the sun and receives its light from it, so is the Emperor inferior to the Pope and receives all power from him.[3] Again, the two authorities were likened to the soul and the body; as the former rules over the latter, so is it ordered that the spiritual power shall rule over and subject the temporal.

The first theory was the impracticable dream of lofty souls who forgot that men are human. Christendom was virtually divided into two hostile camps the members of which were respectively supporters of the imperial and the papal theory. The most interesting and instructive chapters of mediæval history after the tenth century are those that record the struggles between Pope and Emperor, springing from their efforts to reduce to practice and fact these irreconcilable theories.

123. The Restoration of the Papacy. — The great struggle between the emperors and the popes began in the eleventh century. The contest was preluded by the revival and strengthening of both the Empire and the Papacy. It will be recalled how the Empire, after the very idea of it had almost faded from the minds of many, was restored by Otto the Great (sec. 80). A little more than a century later the Papacy was also revived and strengthened. This needs a word of explanation.

Throughout the greater part of the tenth and almost all the first half of the eleventh century, the Papacy had been sunk in the deepest moral degradation. This deplorable state of things had been created largely by the interference in the papal elections — which were nominally in the hands of the Roman clergy and people — by rival feudal factions at Rome which set up and pulled down popes at will. Through such influences it often happened that persons of scandalous life were, through violence and bribery, elevated to the papal chair.[4]

[3] Dante, maintaining the rights of the Emperor, ruined the force of this comparison by pointing out that while the moon often eclipses the sun, the sun never eclipses the moon.

[4] Out of efforts to improve this state of things arose the Sacred College of Cardinals. This body was definitely created by a decree of the Lateran Synod of 1059,

The Papacy owed very largely its rescue from this deep degradation, and its liberation from this humiliating bondage, to the intervention of the imperial power. Among the emperors who did most to effect the moral regeneration of the Roman see was the Emperor Henry III (1039–1056). Exercising his authority as the guardian and protector of the Church, he nominated for the holy office a series of religious-minded and strong men, who were filled with that spirit of reform which just now was issuing from the cloisters of the celebrated monastery of Cluny (sec. 31).

124. Pope Gregory VII (1073–1085) and his Conception of the Papacy. — The most eminent of the reform popes was Pope Gregory VII, better known by his earlier name of Hildebrand, the most noteworthy character, after Charlemagne, that the Middle Ages produced. In the year 1049 he was brought from the cloisters of Cluny to Rome, where he became the maker and adviser of popes, and finally was himself elevated to the pontifical throne, which he held from 1073 to 1085.

Gregory vehemently rejected the idea that the imperial power was superior to the papal, or even that the two were equal and coördinate. "The spiritual power was to stand related to the temporal as the sun to the moon, imparting light and strength, without, however, destroying it, or depriving princes of their sovereignty." In a word, Gregory's idea was that all the Christian states should form a world empire, with the Pope at its head as God's representative on earth.

In order to realize his grand ideal, Gregory, as soon as he became Pope, set about two important reforms, — the enforcement of celibacy among the secular clergy and the suppression of simony. Respecting each of these matters we must speak with some detail.

which acted under the inspiration of Pope Nicholas II. It was at first made up of the leading bishops, priests, and deacons connected with churches in and around Rome; later the members were chosen from a wider field. In 1585 the number of members of the college was fixed at seventy. Vacancies in the body are filled by the Pope. The college now possesses the exclusive right of electing a pope, although at first the inferior Roman clergy enjoyed the privilege of confirmation. This electoral board constitutes one of the most important institutions of the Catholic Church.

125. Gregory VII and the Celibacy of the Clergy. — When Gregory came to the papal throne one grave danger threatening the Church was the marriage of the clergy. From the very first there had prevailed two opposing views respecting the celibacy of the priesthood, some upholding the custom of clerical marriage, and others maintaining the superior sanctity of the unmarried state. In the eleventh century a great part of the minor clergy were married. One great injury to the Church which resulted from this was that it was introducing the feudal principle of heredity. The priests were coming to look upon their offices and the Church lands under their care as fiefs, which they had a right to transmit to their children. With the offices of the Church thus rendered hereditary, it is easy to see how the authority of the Pope over the clergy was being fatally impaired.

Gregory resolved to bring all the clergy to the strict observance of celibate vows. By thus separating the priests from the attachments of home, and lifting from them all family burdens and cares, he aimed to render their consecration to the duties of their offices more whole-souled and their dependence upon the Church more complete.

We will here simply stop to observe that the reform, though most obstinately opposed by a large section of the clergy, was finally effected, — but not in Gregory's lifetime; so that celibacy became as binding upon the priest as upon the monk. It can hardly be doubted that in many ways the reform increased the efficiency of the Catholic priesthood, and certainly greatly enhanced the influence and authority of the popes.

126. Gregory VII and Simony. — Gregory's second reform, the correction of simony, had for one of its ultimate objects the freeing of the lands and offices of the Church from the control of lay lords and princes, and the bringing of them more completely into the hands of the Roman bishop.

The evil of simony[5] had grown up in the Church chiefly in the following way. As the feudal system took possession of

[5] By simony is meant the purchase of an office in the Church, the name of the offense coming from Simon Magus, who offered Peter money for the power to confer the Holy Spirit. See Acts viii. 9–24.

European society, the Church, like individuals and cities, assumed feudal relations. Thus, as we have already seen, abbots and bishops, as the heads of monasteries and churches, for the sake of protection, became the vassals of powerful barons or princes. When once a prelate had promised fealty for his estates or temporalities, as they were called, these became henceforth a permanent fief of the overlord and subject to all the incidents of the feudal tenure. When a vacancy occurred the lord assumed the right to fill it, just as in case of the escheat of a lay fief.[6] In this way the temporal rulers throughout Europe had come to exercise the right of nominating or confirming the election of almost all the great prelates of the Church.

Now, these lay princes who had the patronage of these Church offices and lands handled them just as they did their lay fiefs. They required the person nominated to an abbacy or to a bishopric to pay for the appointment and investiture a sum proportioned to the income from the office. This was in strict accord with the feudal rule which allowed the lord to demand from the vassal, upon his investiture with a fief, a sum of money called a relief (sec. 94). This rule, thus applied to Church lands and offices, was, it is easy to see, the cause of great evil and corruption. The ecclesiastical vacancies were virtually sold to the highest bidder. And then, furthermore, the most unsuitable persons became bishops and abbots. The offices were given to favorites, to mere children, to persons often of the most notoriously evil life.

FIG. 23. — INVESTITURE OF A BISHOP BY A KING THROUGH THE GIVING OF THE CROSIER, OR PASTORAL STAFF. (From a manuscript of the tenth century)

[6] The clergy and monks still retained the nominal right of election, but too frequently an election by them was a mere matter of form. For a typical case see sec. 164.

Such was the deplorable state into which the Church had been brought by the application of feudal principles to ecclesiastical lands and offices. The maintenance of the unity of the Church and the preservation of religion itself demanded that the control of these ecclesiastical positions and estates should be taken away from the lay rulers.

To remedy the evil Gregory issued decrees forbidding any one of the clergy to receive the investiture of a bishopric or abbey or church from the hands of a temporal prince or lord. Any one who should dare to disobey these decrees was threatened with the penalties of the Church.

127. **Excommunications and Interdicts.** — The principal instruments relied upon by Gregory for the carrying out of his decrees were the spiritual weapons of the Church, — Excommunication and Interdict.

The first was directed against individuals. The person excommunicated was cut off from all relations with his fellow-men. If a king, his subjects were released from their oath of allegiance. Any one providing the excommunicate with food or shelter incurred the penalties of the Church. Living, the excommunicated person was to be shunned and abhorred as though tainted with an infectious disease; and dead, he was to be refused the ordinary rites of burial.

The interdict was directed against a city, province, or kingdom. Throughout the region under this ban the churches were closed; no bell could be rung, no marriage celebrated, no burial ceremony performed. The sacraments of baptism and extreme unction alone could be administered.

It is difficult for us in these modern skeptical times to realize the effect of these bans during the "Age of Faith." They rarely failed in bringing the most contumacious offender to a speedy and abject confession, or in effecting his undoing. This will appear in the following paragraph.

128. **The Investiture Contest; Emperor Henry IV's Humiliation at Canossa** (1077.) — It was in Germany that Gregory experienced the most formidable opposition to his reform measures. The

Emperor elect, King Henry IV (1056–1106), — who had been threatened by the Pope with excommunication and deposition, — gathering in council such of the prelates of the Empire as would answer his call (1076), even dared to bid him descend from the papal throne. Gregory in turn gathered a council at Rome and deposed and excommunicated the Emperor. "In the name of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," thus ran the solemn papal decree, "I withdraw through thy [St. Peter's] power and authority, from Henry the King, son of Henry the Emperor, who has arisen against thy Church with unheard-of insolence, the rule over the whole kingdom of the Germans and over Italy. And I absolve all Christians from the bond of the oath which they have made or shall make to him; and I forbid any one to serve him as king." [7]

Henry's deposition encouraged a revolt on the part of some of his discontented subjects. He was shunned as a man accursed by Heaven. His authority seemed to have slipped entirely out of his hands, and his kingdom was on the point of going to pieces. In this wretched state of his affairs there was but one thing for him to do, — to go to Gregory and humbly sue for pardon and reinstatement in the favor of the Church.

Henry sought Gregory among the Apennines, at Canossa, a stronghold of the celebrated Countess Matilda of Tuscany. But Gregory refused to admit him to his presence. It was winter, and on three successive days the king, clothed in sackcloth, stood with bare feet in the snow of the courtyard of the castle, waiting for permission to kneel at the feet of the pontiff and to receive forgiveness.

This was one of the most noteworthy transactions, in its moral significance, that the world had ever witnessed, — the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, the successor of the Cæsars and of Charlemagne, a rejected penitent at the door of the Roman pontiff.

On the fourth day the king was admitted to the presence of Gregory, and the sentence of excommunication was removed (1077). Henry had "stooped to conquer," for the victory was

[7] Henderson, *Select Historical Documents*, p. 377.

really his. He had forced absolution from an unwilling Pope, and this release from the Church's censure meant much then to Henry and his cause.

Henry was now able to avenge his humiliation. He raised an army and descended upon Rome. The Normans, under Robert Guiscard (sec. 112), came to the Pope's defense. In the fighting and confusion which followed, Rome was reduced almost to ruins. Gregory was constrained to seek an asylum at Salerno, where he died in 1085. His last words were, "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile."

But the quarrel did not end here. It was taken up by the successors of Gregory, and Henry was again excommunicated. After maintaining a long struggle with the power of the Church, and with his own sons, who were incited to rebel against him, he finally died broken-hearted (1106). For five years his body was denied burial in consecrated ground; but at last the ban of the Church was removed, and it was laid to rest with fitting honors.

129. **Concordat of Worms** (1122).— Henry's humiliation, though it purchased him a personal victory, gave a severe blow to the prestige of the imperial power. Nevertheless his successors maintained the quarrel with the popes. The outcome of the matter, after many years of bitter contention, was the celebrated Concordat of Worms (1122). It was agreed that all bishops and abbots of the Empire, after free canonical election, should receive the ring and staff, the symbols of their spiritual jurisdiction, from the Pope, but that the Emperor should exercise the right of investiture by the touch of a scepter, the emblem of temporal rights and authority. This was a recognition by both parties that all spiritual authority emanates from the Church and all temporal authority from the State. It was a compromise, — "a rendering unto Cæsar of the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

But however equal the compromise may at first blush appear, it was after all a moral victory for the Papacy. The Concordat rescued the Church from the grave danger of complete secularization; for the triumph of the lay power in its contention would

have made the Church a part of the constitution of the feudal empire and monarchy, just as the temple in ancient Greece and Rome was a part of the constitution of the city-state.

We must here drop the story of the contentions of Pope and Emperor in order to watch the peoples of Europe as at the time we have now reached they undertake with surprising unanimity and enthusiasm the most remarkable enterprises in which they were ever engaged, — the Crusades, or Holy Wars.

It was the prestige and strength which the Papacy had gained in its contest with the Empire which enabled the popes to exert such an influence in setting the Crusades in motion and in directing them; while at the same time it was these great enterprises which, reacting upon the Papacy, greatly aided the popes in realizing Gregory's ideal of making the papal authority supreme throughout Western Christendom.

Selections from the Sources. — DANTE, *De Monarchia* (trans. by Aurelia Henry). Dante's argument is this: first, he shows the need of a supreme temporal ruler; second, he proves from history that the Roman Empire "was willed of God"; and third, he argues that the authority of the Emperor comes direct from God and not from the Pope. The work is a most instructive illustration of mediæval ideals and mediæval reasoning. HENDERSON, *Select Historical Documents*, pp. 351–409, "Decrees concerning Papal Elections and Documents relating to the Controversy over Investiture."

Secondary Works. — BRYCE, *The Holy Roman Empire.* This little work has become a classic. BOWDEN, *Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh.* LEA, *Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church.* Chapter xiv is devoted to Gregory's reforms. ADAMS, *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. x. EMERTON, *Mediæval Europe*, chaps. vii and viii. ALZOG, *Universal Church History*, vol. ii, pp. 253–336 and 481–510. TOUT, *The Empire and the Papacy.* STEPHENS, *Hildebrand and his Times.* VINCENT, *The Age of Hildebrand;* earlier chapters.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Hildebrand and the monastery of Cluny. 2. The Sacred College of Cardinals. 3. The Interdict. 4. The Emperor Henry IV at Canossa. 5. The Countess Matilda.

CHAPTER XII

THE CRUSADES (1096–1273)

I. Preparation of Europe for the Crusades

130. The Crusades defined; their Place in Universal History. — The Crusades were great military expeditions carried on intermittently for two centuries by the Christian peoples of Europe for the purpose of rescuing from the hands of the Mohammedans the holy places of Palestine and maintaining in the East a Latin kingdom. Historians usually enumerate eight of these expeditions as worthy of special narration. Of these eight the first four are often designated the Principal Crusades and the remaining four the Minor Crusades. But besides these there were a children's crusade and several other expeditions, which, being insignificant in numbers or results, are not usually enumerated, as well as several enterprises in Europe itself which partook of the nature of crusades.

Viewed from the broadest standpoint the Crusades against the Moslems were simply an episode in that age-long drama of the struggle between the East and the West, between Asia and Europe, of which the contest between the ancient Greeks and Persians was the opening act. Looked at in connection with a narrower cycle of events, they mark the culmination of the long contest between the two great world religions, Islam and Christianity, the beginnings of which we have already seen, and which expresses itself to-day in the antagonism between the Ottoman Turks and the Christian races of Europe.

We shall tell first of the causes which gave birth to these remarkable enterprises; then narrate with some degree of particularity the most important events which characterized the First

Crusade, passing more lightly over the incidents of the succeeding ones, as these in all essential features were simply repetitions of the first movement; and follow this with a very short account of the crusades within the limits of Europe. Then we shall close our brief survey of the crusading movements with a summary of their results for civilization.

131. **The Religious Motive; Pilgrimages.** — The chief moving force of the Holy Wars was the religious ideas and feelings of the times, particularly the sentiment respecting holy places and pilgrimages. In all ages men have been led by curiosity, sentiment, or religion to make pilgrimages to spots which retain the memory of remarkable occurrences, or have been consecrated by human suffering or heroism. Especially has the religious sentiment of every people made the birthplaces or the tombs of their prophets, saints, and martyrs places of veneration and pilgrimage. Benares, Mecca, and Jerusalem attest the universality and strength of the sentiment among Hindus, Mohammedans, and Christians alike.

Among the early Christians it was thought a pious and meritorious act to undertake a journey to some sacred place. Especially was it thought that a pilgrimage to the land whose soil had been pressed by the feet of the Saviour of the world, to the Holy City that had witnessed his martyrdom, was a peculiarly pious undertaking, and one which secured for the pilgrim the special favor and blessing of Heaven.

Pilgrims began to make visits to the Holy Land from the countries of Western Europe as soon as Christianity had taken possession of this part of the Roman Empire. At first the journey was so difficult and dangerous that it was undertaken by comparatively few. Before the conversion of the Hungarians, who held the land route between Germany and the Bosporus, the pilgrim usually made his way to some Mediterranean port, and sought a chance passage on board some vessel engaged in the Eastern trade.

The Cluniac revival of the eleventh century (sec. 31), kindling as it did a holy fervor in multitudes of souls, gave a great impulse

to this pilgrimaging zeal, and caused the number of pilgrims to the Holy Land greatly to increase. Instead of solitary travelers, companies numbering hundreds and even thousands[1] might now be seen crowding the roads leading to Jerusalem; for the conversion of the Hungarians had recently reopened the overland route down the Danube.

But just at this time a great revolution took place in the political affairs of the East. The Seljuk Turks, a prominent Tartar tribe, zealous proselytes of Islam, wrested Syria from the tolerant Saracen caliphs. The Christians were not long in realizing that power had fallen into new hands. Pilgrims were insulted and persecuted in every way. The churches in Jerusalem were, in some cases, destroyed or turned into stables.

Now, if it were a meritorious thing to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulcher, much more would it be a pious act to rescue the sacred spot from the profanation of infidels. This was the conviction that changed the pilgrim into a warrior, — this the sentiment that for two centuries and more stirred the Christian world to its profoundest depths and cast the population of Europe in wave after wave upon Asia.

132. **The Growth of a Martial Spirit in the Church; the Church and Chivalry.** — This transformation of pilgrimages into crusades would not have been possible had not the Church itself in the course of the centuries undergone an amazing transformation. In the earliest Christian times a Quaker spirit ruled the Church; by the eleventh century a martial spirit had taken complete possession of it. Christ had commanded his disciples to put up the sword; now the head of the Church commanded all to gird on the sword and fight for the faith.

Various causes and circumstances had concurred to effect in the Church this astonishing transformation. First, Christianity, while transforming the barbarians, had been itself transformed by them. The new converts had carried their martial spirit into the Church. Fighters they had been and fighters they remained.

[1] The largest company of which there is record numbered 7000 persons. This was led by an archbishop and set out in the year 1064.

Transformed by this alien spirit the Church modified its early Quaker teachings, and came at last to approve the military life, which the first Christians had very generally condemned as incompatible with the teachings of the Master.

A second cause of the transformation is to be sought in the mediæval way of thinking about ordeals, especially the ordeal of battle. As we have seen, the idea underlying the wager of battle was that God would miraculously intervene and give victory to the right. How natural then the belief that in the greater matter of a battle between armies God might be trusted to give righteous judgment. This conviction was reënforced by the chronicles of the Old Testament. In the wars waged by the Jews at the command of Jehovah against their heathen enemies the mediæval Christians found ample warrant for their crusades against the pagan and infidel enemies of the Church.

Still a third influence that helped to introduce the military spirit into the Church was the reaction upon it of the martial creed of Islam. For three centuries and more before the First Crusade the Moslems had been in contact, and during much of this time in actual combat, with the Christians of Europe. Under such circumstances the Church, as was natural, caught the military spirit of Mohammedanism and became quite as ready as its rival to call upon its followers to fight in defense or for the spread of the faith.

This military spirit in Christendom found characteristic expression in chivalry. We have already spoken of the relation of the Church to the institution of knighthood (sec. 103). Chivalry passed under its tuition and patronage. When at the close of the eleventh century there went forth the papal call for volunteers for the Holy Wars, it fell upon the willing ears of myriads of knights eager to make good their oaths of knighthood and to win renown in combat with the Moslem infidel. Once the old pagan Roman had made use of these same war-loving men of the North to fight the battles of the Empire; now the new Christian Rome enlists them beneath her standard to fight the battles of the Cross.

133. The Peace and the Truce of God. — Closely connected with the subject of the preceding paragraph, and also related in a very significant way to the Crusades, was the institution established by the Church in the eleventh century and known as the "Truce of God."

We have already become acquainted in some measure with the anarchical condition of society under feudalism. The central authority of the state was everywhere relaxed, and neither the emperors nor the kings were able to put a stop to the marauding and fighting of the great feudal lords. This right of waging private war was one of the most dearly prized privileges of these semicivilized barons. They were quite as unwilling to give up this right as the nations of to-day are to surrender their right of public war. So Europe had reverted to that condition of perpetual warfare between tribes and clans that the continent was in before Rome arose, and after centuries of titanic effort established throughout her wide Empire what was called the "Roman Peace" (*Pax Romana*). Every land was filled with fightings and violence. As one writer pictures it: "Every hill was a stronghold, every plain a battlefield. The trader was robbed on the highway, the peasant was killed at his plow, the priest was slain at the altar. Neighbor fought against neighbor, baron against baron, city against city."

In the midst of this intolerable anarchy the Church lifted up a protesting voice. In the early part of the eleventh century there was a movement in France which aimed at the complete abolition of war between Christians. The Church proposed to do what had been effected for a time by the Cæsars. It proclaimed what was called the "Peace of God." In the name of the God of peace it commanded all men to refrain from war and robbery and violence of every kind as contrary to the spirit and the teachings of Christianity. But it was found utterly impossible to make men desist from waging private wars, even though they were threatened with the everlasting tortures of hell.

Then the clergy in Southern France, seeing they could not suppress the evil entirely, concluded it were wiser to try to

regulate it. This led to the promulgation of what was called the "Truce of God." We find the first trace of this in the year 1041.[2] The movement connects itself, as do almost all great moral reforms at this time, with the Cluniac revival.

In the year named the abbot of Cluny and several bishops united in issuing an edict in which all men were commanded to maintain a holy and unbroken peace during four days of the week, from Thursday evening to Monday morning, that is, during the days which were supposed to be rendered peculiarly sacred by the Saviour's death, burial, and resurrection. Whosoever should dare disobey the decree was threatened with the severest penalties of the Church.

This movement to redeem at least a part of the days from fighting and violence embraced in time all the countries of Western Europe. The details of the various edicts issued by Church councils and by the popes varied widely, but all embraced the principle of the edict of 1041.

This Truce of God was not, as we may easily believe, very well observed; yet it did at least something during the eleventh and twelfth centuries to better the general condition of things, to mitigate the evils of private warfare, and to render life more tolerable and property more secure. We shall see a little later how the Church used the restraining authority it had acquired in this field to make it possible and safe for the feudal barons and knights, leaving their fiefs and other possessions under the protecting ægis of the Church, to go with their retainers on the distant expeditions of the Crusades.

134. Norman Restlessness and Crusading Zeal. — To the various causes and antecedents of the Crusades already noticed must be added, as a near inciting cause, that spirit of adventure and unrest with which almost all the lands of Western Europe were at just this time being filled by the enterprises of the Normans. The conquest of England by William the Conqueror and that of Southern Italy and Sicily by other Norman leaders were simply two of the most important of their undertakings. Throughout

[2] Kluckhohn, *Geschichte des Gottesfriedens*, p. 38.

the eleventh century the Norman knights, true to the old Viking spirit of their ancestors, were constantly raiding in Spain, in Africa, and in other Moslem lands. Everywhere they engaged in battle with the infidels. Everywhere they stirred up the embers of the old fierce hate between Christian and Moslem. Everywhere throughout Western Christendom they awakened, by their restless zeal, the crusading spirit, and thus did much to prepare the way for the Holy Wars.

135. **Various Minor Causes.** — We have now detailed the chief causes, remote and immediate, of the Crusades. But there were other concurring causes which must not be overlooked. Many took part in the expeditions from mere love of change, excitement, and adventure. Some of the Italian cities engaged in the undertakings from commercial or political motives. Many knights, princes, and even kings headed expeditions with a view of securing fiefs in the East from lands wrested from the infidel. Multitudes of serfs joined them to escape from a life of misery that had become unbearable. And vast numbers of the baser sort joined them in order to secure immunity from the penalty of debt and crime; for, as we shall see, the person and property of the crusader were taken under the special protection of the Church.

Yet notwithstanding that so many unworthy motives animated vast numbers of those engaging in the Crusades, we shall not be wrong in thinking that it was the religious feeling of the times, the conviction that the enterprise of rescuing the sacred places was a holy one, which was the main motive power, in the absence of which all the other causes and motives enumerated would have proved wholly inadequate either to set in motion or to keep in motion these remarkable and long-continued expeditions. Because it was a generous religious sentiment that organized them, because it was the moving force of a grand religious ideal that maintained them so long, they are rightly called Holy Wars.

136. **Circumstances favoring the Crusading Enterprises.** — Notwithstanding the number and strength of the forces that concurred to transform the population of the West into zealous crusaders,

the Holy Wars would not have been possible, or would have failed to meet with even the partial and temporary success that attended them, had it not been for several favoring circumstances.

First, just before this time the Hungarians had been converted, and thus the overland route to the East, which for centuries had been barred by heathen hordes, was reopened. Thus was the pathway for the earlier Crusades prepared.

FIG. 24. — RECEPTION OF CRUSADERS BY THE KING OF HUNGARY. (From a fifteenth-century manuscript; after *Lacroix*)

Second, the growth during the tenth and eleventh centuries of the sea power of the republics of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa, together with that of the Normans, and the conquest by the latter of Sicily from the Saracens (sec. 112), enabled the Christians to clear the Middle Mediterranean of the Moslem pirate ships that had vexed its waters and shores ever since the rise of the Mohammedan power. Because of the crusaders' dread of the sea, the water route to Palestine was not followed by the earlier expeditions; but the advantages of the water passage gradually came to be realized and all the later expeditions reached their destination by ship. From the beginning of the movements it was alone the command of the sea by the Italian cities that rendered possible that transport service which was indispensable to the maintenance of the colonies established in Palestine as a result of the First Crusade.

Third, just four years before the First Crusade the vast empire which had been established in Asia by the Seljuk Turks fell to pieces and was replaced by a number of mutually jealous Turkish principalities. This was a most fortunate circumstance for the first crusaders, for had they been compelled to encounter the undivided forces of the original empire, it is not probable that any of them would ever have reached the Holy Land.

Fourth, the cause of the Christians was greatly furthered by the antagonism of the Arabs and the Turks. This antagonism — which has been prolonged to our own day — almost fatally divided the strength of the Mohammedan world.

Finally, the development within the Church of the papal power was a circumstance in the absence of which the Crusades could never have found a place in the history of Western Christendom. The popes used their preëminent authority to persuade the people to engage in the wars as pious undertakings. It was they who incited, organized, and directed with greater or less success the expeditions, and to them belongs whatever measure of praise or of censure attaches to the enterprises as a whole.

137. The Legend of Peter the Hermit. — There is a tradition which makes one immediate inciting cause of the First Crusade to have been the preaching of a monk named Peter the Hermit, a native of France. This legend tells how the monk, moved by devout longing, made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land; how his sympathy and indignation were stirred by the sight of the indignities and cruelties to which the native and the pilgrim Christians were subjected by the infidels; and how, armed with letters from the patriarch of Jerusalem to the Christians of Europe, he hastened to Rome, and there, at the feet of Pope Urban II, begged to be commissioned to preach a crusade for the deliverance of the Holy City. The Pope is represented as commending warmly the zeal of the hermit, and, with promises of aid, sending him forth to stir up the people to engage in the holy undertaking.

The legend now exhibits the monk as going everywhere, and addressing in the streets and in the open fields the crowds that press about him. The people look upon the monk, clothed in

the coarse raiment of an anchorite, as a messenger from Heaven, and even venerate the ass upon which he rides. His wild and fervid eloquence alternately melts his auditors to tears, or lifts them into transports of enthusiasm.

Such, in essential features, is the tradition of Peter the Hermit. The first part of this account is now discredited, and it seems quite certain that the monk's alleged pilgrimage to Jerusalem is a pure embellishment of the tale by later romancers. That the preaching of the monk, however, was of a most extraordinary character and produced a deep impression upon the popular mind is beyond doubt. But the real originator of the First Crusade was Pope Urban, and not the hermit, as the legend represents.

138. **The Council of Clermont** (1095). — While the religious feelings of the Christians of the West were growing tenser day by day, the Turks in the East were making constant advances, until at last they were threatening Constantinople itself. The Emperor Alexis Comnenus sent urgent letters to the Pope, asking for aid against the infidels, representing that, unless help were extended immediately, the capital with all its holy relics must soon fall into the hands of the barbarians.

Pope Urban called a great council of the Church at Piacenza in Italy to consider the appeal, but nothing was effected at this meeting. Later in the same year a new council was convened at Clermont in France, Urban purposely fixing the place of meeting among the warm-tempered and martial Franks. Fourteen archbishops, two hundred and twenty-five bishops, four hundred abbots, and of others a multitude that no man could number, crowded to the council.

After the meeting had considered some minor matters the question which was agitating all hearts was brought before it. The Pope himself was one of the chief speakers. He possessed the gift of eloquence, so that the man, the cause, and the occasion all contributed to the achievement of one of the greatest triumphs of human oratory. Urban pictured the humiliation and misery of the provinces of Asia; the profanation of the places made sacred by the presence and footsteps of the Son of God; and then he

detailed the conquests of the Turks, until now, with almost all Asia Minor in their possession, they were threatening Europe from the shores of the Hellespont. "When Jesus Christ summons you to his defense," exclaimed the eloquent pontiff, "let no base affection detain you in your homes; whoever will abandon his house, or his father, or his mother, or his wife, or his children, or his inheritance, for the sake of his name, shall be recompensed a hundredfold and possess life eternal."

Here the enthusiasm of the vast assembly burst through every restraint. With one voice they cried, "*Dieu le volt! Dieu le volt!*" "It is the will of God! It is the will of God!" Thousands immediately affixed the cross[3] to their garments as a pledge of their engagement to go forth to the rescue of the Holy Sepulcher. The following summer was set for the expedition.

II. The First Crusade (1096–1099)

139. Mustering of the Crusaders. — It was the countries of France and Southern Italy that were most deeply stirred by the papal call. In these lands the contagion of the enthusiasm seized upon almost all classes alike; for it was the common religious feeling of the age to which the appeal had been especially made. The Council of Clermont had proclaimed anew the Truce of God, with a very great extension of its prohibitions, and had pronounced anathemas against any one who should invade the possessions of a prince engaged in the Holy War. By edict the Pope had granted to all who should enlist from right motives "remission of all canonical penalties," and promised to the truly penitent, in case they should die on the expedition, "the joy of life eternal."

Under such inducements princes and nobles, bishops and priests, monks and anchorites, saints and sinners, rich and poor, hastened to enroll themselves beneath the standard of the Cross. "Europe," says Michaud, "appeared to be a land of exile, which every one was eager to quit."

[3] Hence the name "Crusades" given to the Holy Wars, from Old French *crois*, "cross."

140. The Vanguard. — Before the regular armies of the crusaders were ready to move, those who had gathered about Peter the Hermit, becoming impatient of delay, urged him to place himself at their head and lead them at once to the Holy Land. Dividing command of the mixed multitudes with a poor knight called Walter the Penniless, and followed by a throng, it is said, of eighty thousand persons,[4] among whom were many women and children, the hermit set out for Constantinople by the overland route through Germany and Hungary. Thousands of the crusaders perished miserably of hunger and exposure on the march. Those who crossed the Bosporus were surprised by the Turks, and almost all were slaughtered. Thus perished the forlorn hope of the First Crusade.

141. March of the Main Body; the Capture of Jerusalem (1099). — Meanwhile a real army was gathering in the West. Raymond, Count of Toulouse; Robert, Duke of Normandy; Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lorraine; Bohemund, Prince of Otranto, and his nephew, Tancred, the "mirror of knighthood," were among the most noted of the leaders of the different divisions of the army. The expedition is said to have numbered about three hundred thousand men.

The crusaders traversed Europe by different routes and reassembled at Constantinople. Crossing the Bosporus, they first captured Nicæa, the Turkish capital in Bithynia, and then set out across Asia Minor for Syria. The line of their dreary march between Nicæa and Antioch was whitened with the bones of nearly one half their number. Arriving at Antioch, the survivors captured that place, and then, after considerable delay, pushed on towards Jerusalem.

When at length the Holy City burst upon their view, a perfect delirium of joy seized the crusaders. They embraced one another with tears of joy, and even embraced and kissed the ground on which they stood. As they moved on, they took off their shoes,

[4] As Kugler observes, the enormous figures of the chroniclers can only be taken to mean "a great many people." They represent, of course, simply vague guesses or estimates.

EUROPE AND THE ORIENT
IN 1096
On the eve of the Crusades
Christian Lands (Latin Church)
Mohammedan Lands
Christian Lands (Greek Church)
Regions still Pagan
0 100 200 300 400 500
Scale of Miles
THE M.-N. WORKS, BUFFALO, N.Y.
Longitude East 10° from Greenwich
0°
10°
30°
40°
50°
60°
ATLANTIC OCEAN
NORTH SEA
IRELAND
SCOTLAND
ENGLAND
WALES
London
Hastings
Bruges
DENMARK
Lübeck
Aix-la-Chapelle
Cologne
Coblenz
Rouen
Normandy
Paris
HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE
Worms
FRANCE
Clermont
Cluny
St. Gall
Milan
Venice
Genoa
Piacenza
Pisa
Florence
Rome
Salerno
Corsica
Sardinia
Balearic Is.
MEDITERRANEAN
Sicily
Tunis
Marseilles
Avignon
Toulouse
Albi
Languedoc
KINGDOM OF CASTILE
K. OF NAVARRE
K. OF ARAGON
R. Ebro
R. Tagus
Lisbon
Cordova
Seville
EMPIRE OF THE ALMORAVIDES
CALIPHATE OF

20°
30°
40°
50°
Lithuanians
Prussians
GRAND DUCHY OF RUSSIA
R. Vistula
Kiev
R. Dnieper
R. Don
Petchenegs
Comans or
HUNGARY
BLACK SEA
R. Danube
Adrianople
Bosphorus
Constantinople
Nicæa
Angora
Dorylæum
EMPIRE OF THE SÆLJUK TURKS
Ephesus
Smyrna
Athens
Peloponnesus
Rhodes
Cyprus
Crete
Antioch
Tripolis
Berytus
Sidon
Tyre
Acre
Damascus
Cæsarea
Jaffa
Ascalon
Gaza
Jerusalem
Dead Sea
Damietta
Alexandria
Cairo
Egypt
Palestine
FATIMITES
THE EAST
Brindisi
Otranto
Hellespont

and marched with uncovered head and bare feet, singing the words of the prophet: "Jerusalem, lift up thine eyes, and behold the liberator who comes to break thy chains."

The city was taken by storm. A terrible slaughter of the infidels followed. "And if you desire to know what was done with the enemy who were found there," thus runs a home letter of one of the crusaders, "know that in Solomon's Porch and in his temple our men rode in the blood of the Saracens up to the knees of their horses."

142. **Founding of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.** — The government which the crusaders established for the city and country they had conquered was a model feudal state, called the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. The code known as the Assizes of Jerusalem, which was a late compilation of the rules and customs presumably followed by the judges of the little state, forms one of the most interesting collections of feudal customs in existence.

At the head of the kingdom was placed Godfrey of Bouillon, the most devoted of the crusader knights. The prince refused the title and vestments of royalty, declaring that he would never wear a crown of gold in the city where his Lord and Master had worn a crown of thorns. The only title he would accept was that of "Baron of the Holy Sepulcher."

Many of the crusaders, considering their vows to deliver the Holy City as now fulfilled, soon set out on their return to their homes, some making their way back by sea and some by land.

III. The Second Crusade (1147–1149)

143. **Origin of the Religious Orders of Knighthood.** — In the interval between the First and the Second Crusade, the two famed religious military orders known as the Hospitalers and the Templars [5] were formed. A little later, during the Third Crusade, still

[5] The Hospitalers, or Knights of St. John, took their name from the fact that the organization was first formed among the monks of the Hospital of St. John at Jerusalem; while the Templars, or Knights of the Temple, were so called on account of one of the buildings of the brotherhood occupying the site of Solomon's

another fraternity known as the Teutonic Knights was established. The objects of all the orders were the care of the sick and wounded crusaders, the entertainment of Christian pilgrims, the guarding of the holy places, and ceaseless battling for the Cross. These fraternities soon acquired a military fame that was spread throughout the Christian world. They were joined by many of the most illustrious knights of the West, and through the gifts of the pious acquired great wealth, and became possessed of numerous estates and castles in Europe as well as in Asia.

144. **The Fall of Edessa** (1144); **Preaching of St. Bernard; Failure of the Crusade.** — In the year 1146, the city of Edessa, the outlying bulwark on the side towards Mesopotamia of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, was taken by the Turks and the entire population slaughtered or sold into slavery. This disaster threw Europe into a state of the greatest alarm lest the little Christian state should be overwhelmed and all the holy places should again fall into the hands of the infidels.

The scenes that marked the opening of the First Crusade were now repeated in many of the countries of the West. St. Bernard of Clairvaux, an eloquent monk, was the second Peter the Hermit who went everywhere arousing the warriors of the Cross to the defense of the birthplace of their religion. The contagion of the enthusiasm seized upon not merely barons, knights, and the common people, which classes alone participated in the First Crusade, but the greatest sovereigns were now infected by it. Louis VII, king of France, was led to undertake the crusade through remorse for an act of great cruelty of which he had been guilty against some of his revolted subjects.[6] The Emperor Conrad III of Germany was persuaded to leave the affairs of his distracted realms in the hands of God and consecrate himself to the defense of the sepulcher of Christ.

Temple. In the case of the Hospitalers it was monks who added to their ordinary monastic vows those of knighthood; in the case of the Templars it was knights who added to their military vows those of religion. Thus were united the seemingly incongruous ideals of the monk and the knight.

[6] The act which troubled the king's conscience was the burning of 1300 people in a church, whither they had fled for refuge.

The best part of the strength of both the German and the French division of the expedition was wasted in Asia Minor. Mere remnants of the armies joined in Palestine. The siege of Damascus, which was now undertaken, proved unsuccessful, and the crusaders returned home, "having accomplished all that God willed and the people of the country permitted."

IV. The Third Crusade (1189–1192)

145. Capture of Jerusalem by Saladin; Leaders of the Crusade. — The Third Crusade was caused by the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin, the renowned sultan of Egypt. This event occurred in the year 1187. The intelligence of the disaster caused the greatest consternation and grief throughout Christendom. Three of the great sovereigns of Europe, Frederick Barbarossa of Germany, Philip Augustus of France, and Richard I of England, assumed the cross, and set out, each at the head of a large army, for the recovery of the Holy City.

The English king, Richard, afterwards given the title of *Cœur de Lion*, the "Lion-hearted," in memory of his heroic exploits in Palestine, was the central figure among the Christian knights of this crusade.

146. Death of Frederick Barbarossa; the Siege of Acre. — The German army, attempting the overland route, after meeting with the usual troubles in Eastern Europe from the unfriendliness of the natives, was decimated in Asia Minor by the hardships of the march and the swords of the Turks. The Emperor Frederick was drowned while crossing a swollen stream, and most of the survivors of his army, disheartened by the loss of their leader, soon returned to Germany.

The English and French kings — the first sovereigns of these two countries who had ever joined their arms in a common cause — took the sea route, and finally mustered their forces beneath the walls of Acre, which city the Christians were then besieging. After one of the longest and most costly sieges they ever carried

on in Asia, the crusaders at last forced the place to capitulate, in spite of all the efforts of Saladin to render the garrison relief.

147. **Richard's Captivity and Ransom.** — For two years Richard contended in vain with Saladin, a knightly and generous antagonist according to the chroniclers, for possession of the tomb of Christ. He then concluded with him a truce of three years and eight months, which provided that the Christians during that period should have free access to the holy places and remain in undisturbed possession of the coast from Acre to Ascalon.

Richard now set out for home. But while traversing Germany in disguise he was discovered and was arrested and imprisoned by order of the Emperor Henry VI, who was his political enemy. Henry cast his prisoner into a dungeon, and, notwithstanding the outcry of all Europe that the champion of Christianity should suffer such treatment at the hands of a brother prince, refused to release him without an enormous ransom.

The English people, so great was their admiration for the hero whose prowess had reflected such luster upon English knighthood, set themselves to raise the sum demanded, even stripping the churches of their plate to make up the amount; and the lion-hearted crusader was at last set free, and finally reached England, where he was received with wild acclamation.

V. The Fourth Crusade (1202–1204)

148. **Capture of Constantinople by the Latins** (1204). — The city of Venice was the rendezvous of this expedition. It was made up largely of unscrupulous adventurers and the marine forces of Venice. It was originally aimed at Egypt but struck Constantinople. A great share of the responsibility for the diversion of the crusade from its first designation lies, it seems, at the door of the Venetians, who, when it was proposed that the crusaders should undertake to right certain alleged wrongs of the imperial family at the Byzantine capital, seeing in the proposed adventure an opportunity to further their trade interests in the Black Sea

regions, took pains to insure that the expedition should be launched in that direction.

The outcome of the crusade was the capture and sack of Constantinople and the setting up of a Latin prince, Baldwin of Flanders, as Emperor of the East (1204). The Empire was now remodeled into a feudal state like the Kingdom of Jerusalem established by the knights of the First Crusade (sec. 142). Most of the Greek islands and certain of the shore lands of the



FIG. 25. — THE HORSES OF ST. MARK'S. (From a photograph)

These celebrated bronze horses were among the trophies which the Venetians received as their share of the plunder when Constantinople was sacked by the crusaders. They were placed over the portico of St. Mark's in Venice. They were carried off to Paris by Napoleon during his ascendancy, but upon his downfall were restored to the Venetians

old Empire were given to Venice as her share of the spoils. A great part of the remaining lands was allotted as fiefs to Frankish knights. One of the most interesting of the feudal principalities that arose on the ground conquered from the Greeks was the dukedom of Athens. Hundreds of Western knights assembled at this capital of ancient culture and created there a brilliant feudal court which completely captivated the imagination of Europe.[7]

[7] Recall the "Duke Theseus" in Chaucer's Knight's Tale of *Palamon and Arcite* and in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream.*

The Latin Empire of Constantinople, as it was called, lasted only a little over half a century (1204–1261). The Greeks, at the end of this period, succeeded in regaining the throne, which they then held until the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453.

149. Lamentable Results of the Sack of Constantinople. — A most regrettable result of the sack of Constantinople by the crusaders was the destruction of the numerous masterpieces of art with which the city was crowded; for Constantinople had been for nine centuries the chief place of safe deposit for the priceless art treasures of the ancient world. The extent of the loss suffered by art in the ruthless sack of the city will never be known. It would seem as though almost all the bronze and silver statues and all the ornamental metal work of the churches and other edifices of the city went into the melting pot.

Still another lamentable consequence of the crusaders' act was the weakening of the military strength of the capital. For a thousand years Constantinople had been the great bulwark of Western civilization against Asiatic barbarism. Its power of resistance was now broken, with momentous consequences for Western Christendom, as we shall learn later (Chapter XIV).

VI. The Children's Crusades; Minor Crusades

150. The Children's Crusade (1212). — During the interval between the Fourth and the Fifth Crusade the religious enthusiasm that had so long agitated the men of Europe came to fill with unrest the children, resulting in what is known as the Children's Crusade.

The chief preacher of this crusade was a child about twelve years of age, a French peasant lad, named Stephen, who became persuaded that Jesus Christ had commanded him to lead a crusade of children to the rescue of the Holy Sepulcher. The children became wild with excitement and flocked in vast crowds to the places appointed for rendezvous. Nothing could restrain them or thwart their purpose. "Even bolts and bars," says an

old chronicler, "could not hold them." The great majority of those who collected at the rallying places were boys under twelve years of age, but there were also many girls.

The movement excited the most diverse views. Some declared that it was inspired by the Holy Spirit, and quoted such scriptural texts as these to justify the enthusiasm: "A child shall lead them"; "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast ordained praise." Others, however, were quite as confident that the whole thing was the work of the devil.

The German children, whose number is variously estimated at from twenty to forty thousand, crossed the Alps and marched down the Italian shores looking for a miraculous pathway through the sea to Palestine. Beneath the toil and hardships of the journey a great part of the little crusaders died or fell out by the way. Those reaching Rome were kindly received by the Pope, who persuaded them to give up their enterprise and return to their homes, impressing upon their minds, however, that they could not be released from the vows they had made, which they must fulfill when they became men.

The French children, numbering thirty thousand, according to the chroniclers, set out from the place of rendezvous for Marseilles. Their leader, Stephen, rode in great state in a chariot surrounded by an escort of infantile nobles, who paid him the obedience and homage due a superior and sacred being. The little pilgrims had no conception of the distance to the Holy Land, and whenever a city came in sight eagerly asked if it were not Jerusalem.

Arriving at Marseilles, the children were bitterly disappointed that the sea did not open and give them passage to Palestine. The greater part, discouraged and disillusioned, now returned home; five or six thousand, however, accepting gladly the seemingly generous offer of two merchants of the city, who proposed to take them to the Holy Land free of charge, crowded into seven small ships and sailed out of the port of Marseilles. But they were betrayed and sold as slaves in Alexandria and other Mohammedan slave markets. A part of them, however, escaped

this fate, having perished in the shipwreck of two of the vessels that bore them from Marseilles.[8]

This children's expedition marked at once the culmination and the decline of the crusading movement. The fervid zeal that inspired the first crusaders was already dying out. "These children," said the Pope, referring to the young crusaders, "reproach us with having fallen asleep, whilst they were flying to the assistance of the Holy Land."

151. The Minor Crusades; End of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. — The last four expeditions — the Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth[9] — undertaken by the Christians of Europe against the infidels of the East may be conveniently grouped as the Minor Crusades. They were marked by a less genuine enthusiasm than that which characterized particularly the First Crusade, and exhibited among those taking part in them the greatest variety of objects and ambitions. The flame of the Crusades had burned itself out, and the fate of the little Christian kingdom in Asia, isolated from Europe and surrounded on all sides by bitter enemies, became each day more and more apparent. Finally, the last of the places (Acre) held by the Christians fell into the hands of the Moslems, and with this event the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem came to an end (1291). The second great combat between Mohammedanism and Christianity was over, and "silence reigned along the shore that had so long resounded with the world's debate" (Gibbon).

[8] The credibility of that part of the account which deals with the fate of the French children has been questioned, but there is really no ground for rejecting it. See Kugler, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, p. 307 and note.

[9] The *Fifth Crusade* (1216–1220) was led by the kings of Hungary and Cyprus. Its strength was wasted in Egypt, and it resulted in nothing. The *Sixth Crusade* (1227–1229), headed by Frederick II of Germany, succeeded in securing from the Saracens the restoration of Jerusalem and that of several other cities of Palestine. The *Seventh Crusade* (1249–1254) was under the lead of Louis IX of France, surnamed the Saint. It met with disaster in Egypt. The *Eighth Crusade* (1270–1272) had for leaders St. Louis and Prince Edward of England, afterwards Edward I. Louis directed his forces against the Moors about Tunis, in North Africa. Here the king died of the plague. Nothing was effected by this division of the expedition. The division led by the English prince was, however, more fortunate. Edward succeeded in capturing Nazareth and in compelling the sultan of Egypt to agree to a treaty favorable to the Christians (1272).

VII. Crusades in Europe

152. General Statement. — Notwithstanding the strenuous and united efforts which the Christians of Europe put forth against the Mohammedans, they did not succeed in extending permanently the frontiers of Western civilization in the Orient.

But in the southwest and the northeast of Europe it was different. Here the crusading spirit rescued from Moslem and pagan large territories, and upon these regained or newly acquired lands established a number of little Christian principalities, which later grew into states, or came to form a portion of states, which were to play great parts in the history of the following centuries. The states whose beginnings are thus connected with the crusading age are Portugal, Spain, and Prussia. We will say just a single word respecting each of them.

153. Crusades against the Moors in the Iberian Peninsula. — Just before the actual beginning of the Crusades against the Moslems of the East a band of northern knights went to the help of the Christians against the Moslems in the west of the Iberian peninsula. The issue of this chivalric enterprise was the formation of a little feudal principality, the nucleus of the later kingdom of Portugal. At the time of the Second Crusade some German and English crusaders, on their way to Palestine by sea, stopped here and aided the native Christians in the siege and capture from the Mohammedans of the important city of Lisbon (1147). This gave the little growing state its future capital. Thus Portugal was, in a very strict sense, a creation of the crusading spirit.

Then during all the time that the Crusades proper were going on in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Spanish Christian knights were engaged in almost one uninterrupted crusade against the Moslem intruders. By the middle of the thirteenth century the Christians had crowded the Moors into a small region in the southern part of the peninsula. Upon the ground thus regained there arose a number of small Christian states which finally coalesced to form the modern kingdom of Spain. The

circumstances of the origin of this kingdom left a deep impress upon all its subsequent history (sec. 248).

154. Crusades by the Teutonic Knights against the Pagan Slavs (1226–1283). — At the time of the Crusades all the Baltic shore lands lying eastward of the Vistula and which to-day form a part of Prussia were held by pagan Slavs. These people, like the pagan Saxons of an earlier time, resisted strenuously the introduction of Christianity among them. Devoted priests who carried the gospel to them, together with the converts they made, were often massacred. Finally, a crusade was preached against them.

Early in the thirteenth century (1226) some knights of the Teutonic order transferred their crusading efforts to these northern heathen lands. For the greater part of the century the knights carried on what was a desperate and almost continuous war of extermination against the pagans. Upon the land wrested from them were founded the important fortress-cities of Königsberg and Marienburg. The surrounding Slav population was either destroyed or subjected, and the whole land was gradually Germanized. Thus what was originally Slav territory was converted into a German land, and the basis laid of a principality which later came to form an important part of modern Prussia.[10] Thus the crusading zeal of the knight monks contributed to the creation of one of the strongest of modern European states.

155. Crusades against the Albigenses (1209–1229). — During the crusading age holy wars were preached and waged against heretics as well as against infidels and pagans.

In the south of France was a sect of Christians called Albigenses,[11] who had departed so far from the orthodox faith that Pope Innocent III declared them to be "more wicked than Saracens." He therefore, after a vain endeavor to turn them from their errors, called upon the French king, Philip II, and his nobles to lead a crusade against the heretics and their rich and powerful patron, Raymond VI, Count of Toulouse.

[10] See on map of modern Europe how the German territory on the northeast is thrust out into the Slavonic mass.

[11] From *Albi*, the name of a city and district in which their tenets prevailed.

The king held aloof from the enterprise, being fully occupied watching his own enemies; but a great number of his nobles responded eagerly to the call of the Church. The leader of the First Crusade (1209–1213) was Simon de Montfort, a man cruel, callous, and relentless beyond belief. A great part of Languedoc, the beautiful country of the Albigenses, was made a desert, the inhabitants being slaughtered and the cities burned.

In 1229 the fury of a fresh crusade burst upon the Albigenses, which resulted in their prince (Raymond VII) ceding the greater part of his beautiful but ravaged provinces to Louis IX, king of France, and submitting himself to the Church. The Albigensian heresy was soon wholly extirpated by the tribunal of the Inquisition which was set up in the country.

VIII. Influence upon European Civilization of the Crusades

156. Their Effect upon the Eastern Empire. — Among the most noteworthy results of the Crusades we may place the preservation for a time of Constantinople.[12] The shock of the First Crusade rolled back the tide of Turkish conquest, and thus postponed the fall of the Eastern Empire, or at least of its capital, for three centuries and more, thereby gaining for the young Christian civilization of Central Europe time sufficient to consolidate its strength into an impregnable bulwark before the returning tide of Mohammedan invasion swept in again upon Christendom. It is altogether probable that, had the Seljuk Turks been allowed to cross the Bosporus in the twelfth century, they would have carried their conquests much farther towards the West than their kinsmen, the Osmanli, were able to do in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (Chapter XIV).

Furthermore, the fall of Constantinople in the twelfth century would have meant probably the permanent loss of all the literary

[12] But for the crime of the men of the Fourth Crusade (sec. 148) the Eastern emperors might possibly have been able to hold the Bosporus indefinitely against the Ottoman Turks.

treasures the city was holding in safe-keeping for civilization; for the West was not yet ready, as is shown by the vandalism of the men of the Fourth Crusade, to become the appreciative and reverent guardian of this precious bequest.

157. Their Effects upon the Towns and upon Commerce and Society. — The towns gained many political advantages at the expense of the crusading barons and princes. Ready money in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was largely in the hands of the burgher class, and in return for the contributions and loans they made to their overlords or suzerains they received charters conferring special and valuable privileges. Thus, while power and wealth were slipping out of the hands of the nobility, the cities and towns were growing in political importance and making great gains in the matter of municipal freedom.



FIG. 26. — A MEDIÆVAL WINDMILL. (From an engraving of an abbey and its precincts, dating from about the middle of the fourteenth century)

The Holy Wars further promoted the prosperity of the towns by giving a great impulse to commercial enterprise. During this period Venice, Pisa, and Genoa acquired great wealth and reputation through the fostering of their trade by the needs of the crusaders and the opening up of the East. The Mediterranean was whitened with the sails of their transport ships, which were constantly plying between the various ports of Europe and the towns of the Syrian coast. Also, various arts, manufactures, and inventions (among these the windmill[13] and probably the mariner's compass) before unknown in Europe were introduced from Asia. This enrichment of the civilization of the West with the "spoils of the East" we may allow to be emblemized by the famous bronze horses that the crusaders

[13] Windmills were chiefly utilized in the Netherlands, where they were used to pump the water from the oversoaked lands, and thus became the means of creating the most important part of what is now the kingdom of Holland.

carried off from Constantinople and set up before St. Mark's Cathedral in Venice (Fig. 25).

The effects of the Crusades upon the social life of the Western nations were marked and important. Giving opportunity for romantic adventure, they aided powerfully in the development of that institution of knighthood which, as we have seen, nourished many of the noblest virtues and most exalted sentiments of modern society (sec. 109). And under this head must be placed the general refining influence that contact with the more cultured nations of the East had upon the semibarbarous folk of the West. These influences, which we designate the social, were felt of course in the country as well as in the town, but their more permanent impress was probably left upon the life of the urban communities.

158. **Their Political Effects.** — The Crusades, as we have noticed in another connection (sec. 99), helped to break down the power of the feudal aristocracy and give prominence to the kings and the people. Many of the nobles who set out on the expeditions never returned, and their estates, through failure of heirs, escheated to the crown; while many more wasted their fortunes in meeting the expenses of their undertaking. Thus the nobility were greatly weakened in numbers and influence, and the power and patronage of the kings correspondingly increased. This process of the disintegration of feudalism and the growth of monarchy is to be traced most distinctly in France, the cradle and center of the crusading movement.

The laying of the foundations of the later states of Portugal, Spain, and Prussia should also be noticed here as showing how the Crusades helped to create the map of modern Europe.

159. **Their Effects upon the Native Literatures and the Intellectual Life of Europe.** — In no realm were the effects of the Crusades more positive than in the field of literature. From the East was brought in a vast amount of fresh literary material consisting of the traditions of great events like the siege of Troy, and of great heroes, such as Solomon and Alexander the Great. These legends, exaggerated and distorted and curiously mingled with the folk-

lore of the Western peoples, came now to form the basis of a vast literature consisting of romances, epic poems, and pious tales, infinite in variety and form. In this way the native literatures of Europe were enriched and their growth greatly stimulated.

Furthermore, the knowledge of geography and of the science and learning of the East gained by the crusaders through their expeditions greatly stimulated the Latin intellect and helped to awaken in Western Europe that mental activity which resulted finally in the great intellectual outburst known as the Renaissance (Chapter XVIII).

160. Their Influence on Geographical Discovery. — Lastly, the incentive given to geographical exploration led various travelers, such as the celebrated Venetian Marco Polo, to range over the most remote countries of Asia. Nor did the matter end here. Even that spirit of maritime enterprise and adventure which rendered illustrious the close of the Middle Ages, inspiring the voyages of Columbus, Vasco da Gama, and Magellan, may be traced back to that lively interest in geographical matters, that curiosity respecting the remote regions of the earth, awakened by the expeditions of the crusaders.[14]

These various growths and movements, commercial, social, political, intellectual, and geographical, in European society, which, though not originated by the Crusades, were nevertheless given a fresh impulse by them, we shall trace out in following chapters.

Selections from the Sources. — *Chronicles of the Crusades* (Bohn). Read the chronicle by Geoffrey, who writes as an eye-witness of scenes of the Third Crusade. ARCHER, *Crusade of Richard I.* (English History by Contemporary Writers). *Translations and Reprints*, vol. i, No. 4, "Letters of the Crusaders"; also vol. iii, No. 1, "The Fourth Crusade" (both ed. by Dana Carleton Munro). HENDERSON, *Select Historical Documents*, p. 208, "Decree of the Emperor Henry IV concerning a Truce

[14] Colonel Henry Yule, speaking of the influence of the travels and writings of Marco Polo, says: "The spur which his book eventually gave to geographical studies, and the beacon which it hung out at the eastern extremities of the earth, helped to guide the aims . . . of the greater son of the rival republic. His work was at least a link in the providential chain which at last dragged the New World to light." — Introduction to *The Book of Ser Marco Polo* (London, 1875).

of God (1085)." ROBINSON, *Readings in European History*, vol. i, chap. xv. MUNRO and SELLERY, *Mediæval Civilization*, pp. 257–268.

Secondary Works. — SYBEL, *The History and Literature of the Crusades*. For the mature reader. BURR, *The Year 1000 and the Antecedents of the Crusades* (in *Am. Hist. Rev.* for April, 1901, vol. vi, No. 3). Shows the unhistorical character of the tradition of the "millennial terror." ARCHER and KINGSFORD, *The Crusades*. COX, *The Crusades*. BÉMONT and MONOD, *Mediæval Europe*, chap. xxii. EMERTON, *Mediæval Europe*, chap. xi. ADAMS, *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. xi. MICHAUD, *History of the Crusades*. Very interesting, but in part discredited through a new appraisement of the trustworthiness of the sources for the Crusades. PEARS, *The Fall of Constantinople*. The best account of the Fourth Crusade. GRAY, *The Children's Crusade*. OMAN, *Byzantine Empire*, chaps. xxi and xxii. LECKY, *History of European Morals*, vol. ii, pp. 248–254; for the development of the military spirit in the Church. GIBBON, *The Decline and Fall*, chaps. lviii–lxi. CUTTS, *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages*, pp. 157–194, "The Pilgrims of the Middle Ages." LANE-POOLE, *Saladin, and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*. MUNRO and SELLERY, *Mediæval Civilization*, pp. 248–256 and 269–276.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The Palmer. 2. The Truce of God. 3. Letters of the crusaders. 4. St. Bernard and the Second Crusade. 5. Incidents of the Fourth Crusade. 6. The Children's Crusade. 7. St. Louis, king of France, as a crusader.

CHAPTER XIII

SUPREMACY OF THE PAPACY; DECLINE OF ITS TEMPORAL POWER

161. Preliminary Survey: the Papacy at its Height. — In an earlier chapter on the Empire and the Papacy we related the beginnings of the contention for supremacy between Pope and Emperor. In the present chapter we shall first speak of the Papacy at the height of its power, and then tell how, as the popes, with the Empire ruined, seemed about to realize their ideal of a universal ecclesiastical and secular monarchy, its temporal power was shattered by a new opposing force, — the rising nations.

The temporary success of the papal party, and the virtual establishment for a time of a theocracy over Western Christendom, was due more than to aught else to the fortunate succession in the papal chair of great men all animated by the steady purpose of making supreme the authority of the Roman see. We have already noticed the work of some of these makers of the Papacy, notably that of Pope Gregory VII. Gregory had many worthy successors. The most eminent of these were Alexander III (1159–1181) and Innocent III (1198–1216), under whom the power of the Papacy was at its height.

In the paragraphs immediately following we shall glance at some of the events which signalized the pontificates of these representatives of the papal supremacy. The events we shall touch upon are those which record the triumph of the Papacy first over the Empire and then over the kings of France and England.

162. Pope Alexander III and Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. — A little after the settlement known as the Concordat of Worms (sec. 129) the first of the House of Hohenstaufen came to the German throne, and then began a sharp contention, lasting, with

PLATE II. — ST. MARK'S SQUARE, VENICE. (From a photograph taken before the fall of the Campanile; see p. 632)

intervals of strained peace, for more than a century, between the emperors of this proud family and the successive occupants of the papal chair. This contest was practically the continuation, although under changed conditions of course, of the struggle begun long before to decide which should be supreme, the "world priest" or the "world king."

The contention filled Germany and Italy, all the lands over which the emperors claimed supremacy, with turmoil and violence. The story of the struggle, given with any detail, would fill many volumes. In the present connection we can do no more than simply note the issue of the quarrel in so far as it concerned Pope Alexander III and one of the most noted of the Hohenstaufen, Frederick Barbarossa.

In his struggle with the Emperor, the Pope had as allies the Eastern Emperor, the king of Sicily, and, above all others in importance to him, the Lombard cities, who were rebellious towards Frederick because of his assertion and harsh exercise of imperial rights over them. After maintaining the contest for many years Frederick, vanquished and humiliated, was constrained to seek reconciliation with the Pope. Then followed the Peace of Venice (1177) with its dramatic incidents. In front of St. Mark's Cathedral, in the presence of a vast throng, Frederick, overwhelmed by a sudden emotion of awe and reverence, cast off his mantle and flung himself at the feet of the venerable pontiff, who raised him from the ground and gave him the kiss of peace. That was for the imperial power its second Canossa. Precisely one hundred years had passed since the humiliation of the Emperor Henry IV.[1]

163. Pope Innocent III and Philip Augustus of France. — When one of the most powerful and self-reliant of all the emperors after Charlemagne was forced thus to bow before the papal throne, we are not surprised to find the kings of the different countries of Europe subjecting themselves obediently to the same all-pervading authority. French and English history, of the period

[1] See sec. 128. For further notice of Frederick Barbarossa's reign, see secs. 188 and 255.

covered by the pontificate of Innocent III, both afford a striking illustration of the subject relation which the sovereigns of Europe had come to sustain to the papal see.

The French throne was at this time held by Philip Augustus (1180–1223). On some pretext Philip had put away his wife and entered into another marriage alliance. Pope Innocent III, as the censor of the morals of kings as well as of the morals of their subjects, commanded him to take back his discarded queen, and upon his refusal to do so, laid France under an interdict. Philip was finally constrained to yield obedience to the Pope. This triumph of the papal see over so strong and imperious a sovereign has been pronounced "the proudest trophy in the scutcheon of Rome."

164. Pope Innocent III and King John of England. — The story of Innocent's triumph over King John (1199–1216) of England is familiar. The see of Canterbury falling vacant, John ordered the monks who had the right of election to give the place to a favorite of his. They obeyed; but the Pope immediately declared the election void, and caused the vacancy to be filled with one of his own friends, Stephen Langton. John declared that the Pope's archbishop should never enter England as primate, and proceeded to confiscate the estates of the see. Innocent now laid all England under an interdict, excommunicated John, and incited the French king, Philip Augustus, to undertake a crusade against the contumacious rebel.

The outcome of the matter was that John was compelled to yield to the power of the Church. He gave back the lands he had confiscated, acknowledged Langton to be the rightful primate of England, and even went so far as to give England and Ireland to the Pope, receiving them back as a perpetual fief (1213). In token of his vassalage he agreed to pay to the papal see the annual sum of one thousand marks sterling. This tribute money was actually paid, though irregularly, until the reign of Edward III (sec. 169).

165. The Mendicant Orders, or Begging Friars.[2] — The immediate successors of Innocent III found a strong support for their

[2] From *fratres*, *frères*, "brethren."

authority in two new monastic orders known as the Dominican and the Franciscan. They were so named after their respective founders, St. Dominic (1170–1221) of Old Castile and St. Francis (about 1182–1226) of Assisi, in Italy. The principles on which these fraternities were established were very different from those which had shaped all previous monastic orders. Speaking in general terms, until now the monk had sought cloistral solitude primarily in order to escape from the world, and through penance and prayer and contemplation to work out his own salvation. In the new orders the members instead of withdrawing from the world were to remain in it and give themselves wholly to the work of securing the salvation of others.

Again, the orders were also as *orders* to renounce all earthly possessions, and, "espousing Poverty as a bride," to rely entirely for support upon the daily and voluntary alms of the pious.[8] Hitherto, while the individual members of a monastic order must espouse extreme poverty, the house or fraternity might possess any amount of communal wealth. This had led to indolence and laxity of discipline, and the espousal of poverty by the new brotherhood was a protest against the luxurious habits of the old orders.

There was at first a wide difference between the two fraternities. St. Francis and the disciples whom his boundless self-sacrificing charity drew about him devoted themselves, in imitation of Christ and the apostles, to preaching the gospel to the poor and outcast, and to visiting those who were sick and in prison. St. Dominic made his appeal to the higher and cultured class. He conceived his mission to be the combating of heresy, with which the intellectual ferment of the times had begun to fill Christendom.

These different tendencies of the two great founders are tersely expressed in the respective titles given them: St. Francis was called the "Father of the poor"; St. Dominic, the "Hammer

[8] The Mendicant Friars soon came to interpret their vow of poverty more liberally, and believed that they met its obligations when they put the title of the property they acquired in the hands of the Pope, while they themselves simply enjoyed the use of it. The new fraternities grew in time to be among the richest of the monastic orders.

of the heretics." But notwithstanding that the differing genius of the two saints left at first a distinct impress upon their respective orders, still each fraternity in time borrowed much from the other and the two finally became very much alike.

The new fraternities grew and spread with marvelous rapidity, and in less than a generation they had quite overshadowed all the old monastic orders of the Church. The popes conferred upon them many and special privileges, and gradually freed them from all episcopal control. They in turn became the stanchest friends and supporters of the Roman see. They formed a regular, well-drilled, obedient papal soldiery, occupying every point of vantage in Western Christendom. They were to the Papacy of the thirteenth century what the Benedictines had been to Pope Gregory VII, or what the later order of the Jesuits was to be to the papal Church of the period of the Reformation.

166. The Papacy brings the Empire to Virtual Ruin. — We have just seen how the imperial power in the person of one of the greatest of the House of Hohenstaufen was humbled by the papal authority. We have now to witness the utter ruin of this proud house and the downfall of the Empire as a real international force in European affairs.

The Empire fell at the very moment of the culmination of its glory, if not of its power, under the Hohenstaufen Frederick II (1212–1250), whom the historian Freeman ventures to pronounce "the most gifted of the sons of men." No Emperor before him had conceived a loftier ideal of the world empire, nor had any of his predecessors, after the great Charles, by virtue of personal qualities imparted to the imperial office such glamour and brilliancy.

But there were many elements of weakness in the Empire, — selfish ambitions among the German princes, rival aspirants for the imperial crown, national and municipal sentiment in Italy, and the jealousy of outside rulers. All these elements of discontent and opposition were utilized by the popes to effect the undoing of the Emperor. Throughout his long reign, laboring

Lands of the
HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE
under the Franconian Emperors
1024 - 1125
0 50 100 150 200 250
Scale of Miles.
NORTH SEA
BALTIC SEA
DENMARK
HOLSTEIN
Lübeck
Hamburg
SAXONY
Bremen
R. Elbe
POMERANIA
PRUSSIANS
ENGLAND
FRIESLAND
HOLLAND
WESTPHALIA
BRANDENBURG
Brunswick
Madgeburg
R. Oder
POLAND
Bruges
Ghent
FLANDERS
Boulogne
BRABANT
Paderborn
Cologne
Aachen
R. Rhine
THURINGIA
R. Elbe
MEISSEN
LOTHRINGIA
Frankfort
Prague
BOHEMIA
MORAVIA
Laon
Paris
Rheims
FRANCIA
Mainz
Worms
KINGDOM OF GERMANY
CHAMPAGNE
R. Seine
Regensburg
R. Danube
Strassburg
AUSTRIA
Vienna
SUABIA
Basel
Constance
R. Inn
BAVARIA
DUCHY OF BURGUNDY
Zürich
St. Gall
HUNGARY
Cluny
Geneva
CARINTHIA
Clermont
Lyons
Vienne
AUVERGNE
KINGDOM OF BURGUNDY
from 1033
Aosta
Milan
Crema
Verona
STYRIA
CARNIOLA
Turin
Pavia
Venice
R. Rhone
R. Po
CROATIA
TOULOUSE
Genoa
Bologna
Canossa
Ravenna
Nismes
Orange
Avignon
PROVENCE
Lucca
Florence
SERVIA
Arles
Pisa
DALMATIA
ADRIATIC SEA
Narbonne
TUSCANY
Siena
Ancona
ITALY
Corsica
Rome
M. Cassino
Naples
Salerno
Sardinia
Balearic Is.
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
Palermo
CALABRIA
NORMANS
Sicily
NORTH AFRICA
THE M-N. WORKS.

much of the time under all the disabilities of an excommunicate and with his authority in every part of his extended dominions undermined by the hostile activity of the papal agents, the Mendicant Friars, Frederick fought for the maintenance of the dignity and supremacy of the imperial power. He died in 1250 with the heavy consciousness of failure. Pursued by the hostility of the popes, his posterity was extirpated root and branch.

After Frederick II the Empire was never again a real world power. But the emperors in maintaining so long the struggle with the Papacy had given time for a new power to arise, which was destined to avenge them in the overthrow of the Papacy as an international lay authority. This new power was the awakening nations.

167. The Revolt of the Nations. — The fourteenth century marks the turning point in the history of the temporal power of the Papacy. In the course of that century the lay rulers in several of the leading countries of Europe, supported by their subjects, succeeded in regaining their lost independence. France, Germany, and England successively revolted against the Roman see — the expression is not too strong — and formally denied the right of the Pope to interfere in their political or governmental affairs.

But it should be carefully noted that the leaders of this revolt against the secular domination of the Papacy did not think of challenging the spiritual authority of the Pope as the supreme head of the Church. Their attitude was wholly like that of the Italians of our own day, who, while dispossessing the Pope of the last remnant of his temporal sovereignty, abate nothing of their veneration for him as the Vicar of God in all things moral and spiritual.

168. Pope Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair of France. — It was during the pontificate of Boniface VIII (1294–1303) that the secular authority of the popes received a severe blow and began rapidly to decline. Boniface held Gregory VII's exalted views of the prerogatives of the papal office. Taking as his warrant these words of Scripture, "Behold I have set thee over kingdoms and

empires,"[4] he assumed an attitude towards the lay rulers which was certain to bring the ecclesiastical and civil authorities into angry and violent collision. In the year 1296 he issued a bull in which, under pain of excommunication, he forbade all ecclesiastical persons, without papal permission, to pay taxes in any form levied by lay rulers. All civil rulers of whatsoever name, — baron, duke, prince, king, or emperor, — who should presume to impose upon ecclesiastics taxes of any kind, were also to incur the same sentence.[5]

Philip of France regarded the papal claims as an encroachment upon the civil authority. The contention between him and the Pope speedily grew into a bitter and undignified quarrel. In one of his letters to Boniface, Philip addressed the pontiff in words of unseemly and studied rudeness. Philip was bold because he knew that his people were with him. The popular feeling was given expression in a famous States-General which the king summoned in 1302, and in another called together the next year. The three estates of the realm, — the nobility, the clergy, and the commons, — declared that the Pope had no authority in France in political matters; that the French king had no superior save God. For the maintenance of the ancient liberties of the French nation they pledged to Philip their fortunes and their lives.

The end was soon reached. At Anagni, in Italy, a band of soldiers in the French pay, with every indignity, accompanied by blows, made Boniface a prisoner. After three days he was set free by friends and returned to Rome, only, however, to be there made the victim of fresh insults. In a few days he died, broken-hearted, it is said, at the age of eighty-seven (1303).

By all historians of the rise and decline of the temporal power of the popes, the scene at Anagni is placed for historical instruction alongside that enacted more than two centuries earlier at Canossa (sec. 128). The contrasted scenes cannot fail to impress one deeply with the vast vicissitudes in the fortunes of the mediæval Papacy.

[4] Jer. i. 10.

[5] This is the celebrated bull known as *Clericis Laicos.* See Henderson's *Select Historical Documents*, p. 432.

169. Removal of the Papal Seat to Avignon (1309–1376); **Revolt of Germany and England.** — In 1309, through the concurrence of various influences, the papal seat was removed from Rome to Avignon, in Provence, adjoining the frontier of France. Here it remained for a space of nearly seventy years, an era known in Church history as the "Babylonian Captivity." While it was established here all the popes were Frenchmen and their policies were largely dictated by the French kings. Thus the Papacy lost that character of universality which had been the basis of its influence and strength. Under these circumstances it was but natural that outside of France there should be stirred up a more and more angry protest against the interference of the popes in civil matters. The measures taken at this time by the national assemblies of Germany and England, in both of which countries a national sentiment was springing up, show how completely the Papacy had lost prestige as an international power.

In 1338 the German princes with whom rested the right of electing the German king, in opposing the papal claims, declared that the German Emperor derived all his powers from God through them and not from the Pope. The German Diet indorsed this declaration, and the principle that the German Emperor, as to his election and the exercise of his functions, is independent of the papal see became from that time forward a part of the German constitution.

A little later (in 1366), during the reign of Edward III, the English Parliament, acting in a like spirit and temper, put an end to English vassalage to Rome by formally refusing to pay the tribute pledged by King John,[6] and by repudiating wholly the claims of the popes upon England as a fief of the holy see.

170. The Great Schism (1378–1417). — The stirring of the national sentiment in several of the countries of Europe was not the only disastrous result to the Papacy of the Babylonian exile. The removal of the papal court from Rome awakened great discontent in Italy. Rome without the Pope was a widowed city. It was torn by rival factions, its buildings were falling into ruins,

[6] See sec. 164. The payment of this tribute had fallen into arrears.

and cattle "were grazing even to the foot of the altar" in the churches of St. Peter and the Lateran.

The return of the popes to Rome was imperatively necessary if they were to retain any authority in Italy. Finally, Pope Gregory XI was persuaded to break away from the influence of the French king and transfer the papal seat once more to the Eternal City. This was in 1377. The following year Gregory died, and the college of cardinals elected as his successor an Italian prelate, who took the name of Urban VI. The new Pope unfortunately was of a harsh and imperious disposition. His discourteous treatment of the French cardinals angered them, and they, denying the validity of his election, set up an antipope, who under the name of Clement VII established his court at Avignon. Such was the beginning of the Great Schism (1378).

The spectacle of two rival popes, each claiming to be the rightful successor of St. Peter and each denouncing the other, naturally gave the reverence which the world had so generally held for the Roman see a rude shock, and one from which it never fully recovered.

171. **The Church Councils of Pisa** (1409) **and Constance** (1414–1418).—For the lifetime of a generation all Western Christendom was deeply agitated by the bitter and unseemly quarrel. No peaceful solution of the difficulty seemed possible. Some even favored a resort to force. The faculties of the University of Paris invited suggestions as to the best means of ending the schism. They received ten thousand written opinions. The drift of these was in favor of an ecumenical council. Finally, in 1409, a council of the Church assembled at Pisa for the purpose of composing the unfortunate feud. This council deposed both popes and elected Alexander V as the supreme head of the Church. But matters instead of being mended hereby were only made worse; for neither of the deposed pontiffs would lay down his authority in obedience to the demands of the council, and consequently there were now three popes instead of two.

In 1414 another council was called at Constance for the settlement of the growing dispute. One of the claimants resigned and

the other two were deposed. A new pope was then elected, the choice of the assembly falling upon an Italian cardinal, who became Pope Martin V (1417). In his person the Catholic world was again united under a single spiritual head. The schism was outwardly healed, but the wound had been too deep not to leave permanent scars upon the Church.

The Roman pontiffs, although the battles of the lost cause were fought over again and again in different countries, were never able, after the events of the fourteenth century, to exercise such authority over the kings of Europe, or exact from them such obedience in civil affairs, as had been possible for the popes of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The splendid ideal of Hildebrand, though so nearly realized, had at last, as to one half of what he purposed, proved an utter failure.

172. **The Papacy remains a Spiritual Theocracy.** — We say that the Roman pontiffs failed as to one half of their purpose; for while they failed to make good their supremacy in temporal affairs, they did succeed in establishing and perpetuating an absolute spiritual dominion, their plenary authority in all matters of faith being to-day acknowledged by more than one half of all those who bear the name of Christian.

The Council of Constance, indeed, decreed that the Pope is subject to an ecumenical council, and that a decision of the Roman see may be appealed from to the judgment of the Church gathered in one of these great assemblies, which were to be convened at least every ten years. But Martin V, the Pope elected by this same council, in opposition to its edicts, issued a bull declaring "it unlawful for any one either to appeal from the judgment of the apostolic see or to reject its decisions in matters of faith." On the other hand, the Council of Basel, — the third and last of the great reforming councils of the fifteenth century, — which assembled in 1431, setting itself against the principle of papal autocracy, declared any one appealing from a general council of the Church to the Pope to be guilty of heresy.

The papal party, the party of absolutism, carried the day. Only one ecumenical council has been held since the Council of Trent,

which was called in 1545 to pronounce upon the doctrines of Luther; and this assembly (the Vatican Council, 1869–1870) promulgated the decisive edict of papal infallibility.

And thus the Papacy, though its temporal power has been entirely taken from it, and its spiritual authority rejected in general by the northern nations, still remains, as Macaulay says, "not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigor." The Pope is to-day, in the view of more than half of Christendom, the infallible head of a Church that, in the famous words of the brilliant writer just quoted, "was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshiped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveler from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

Selections from the Sources. — HENDERSON, *Select Historical Documents*, p. 430, "John's Concession of England to the Pope"; p. 432, "The Bull 'Clericis Laicos'"; p. 435, "The Bull 'Unam Sanctam.'" ROBINSON, *Readings in European History*, vol. i, chap. xxi. For the Mendicant Friars: *The Mirror of Perfection* (ed. by Paul Sabatier and trans. from the Latin by Sebastian Evans). This is the life of St. Francis written by a companion and disciple. It is a wonderful story simply and lovingly told.

Secondary Works. — BRYCE, *The Holy Roman Empire*, chap. xi, "The Emperors in Italy: Frederick Barbarossa," and chap. xiii, "Fall of the Hohenstaufen." PASTOR, *The History of the Popes*, vol. i (Catholic). EMERTON, *Mediæval Europe*, sections of chaps. ix and x. THATCHER and SCHWILL, *Europe in the Middle Ages*, chap. xxi. BARRY, *The Papal Monarchy*, chaps. xviii–xxv. ADAMS, *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. x (last part) and chap. xvi. ALZOG, *Universal Church History*, vol. ii, pp. 573–586, for Innocent III and his relations to the princes of Europe; and pp. 614–630, for Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair. BALZANI, *The Popes and the Hohenstaufen*. FISHER, *History of the Christian Church*, pp. 240–264. TOUT, *The Empire and the Papacy*, chaps. xi, xiv, xvi, and xxi. FREEMAN, *Historical Essays* (First Series), "Frederick II." SABATIER, *Life of St. Francis of Assisi;* a book of genius and spiritual insight. JESSOPP, *The Coming of the Friars*. CREIGHTON, *History of the Papacy*, vol. i, "The Great Schism; The Council of Constance."

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Incidents of the Peace of Venice (1177). 2. St. Francis of Assisi. 3. St. Dominic. 4. The popes at Avignon.

CHAPTER XIV

THE MONGOLS AND THE OTTOMAN TURKS

I. The Mongols

173. The Three Invasions. — We have witnessed two invasions of civilized Europe, one by the Germanic tribes from the north and another by the Saracens from the south, and have noted the effects of each upon the course of general history. Our attention is now drawn to a third invasion, this time from the east, by nomadic races of Asia, — the Mongols and the Ottoman Turks.[1]

The ultimate results for European civilization of the Teutonic invasion were, as we have seen, salutary and beneficial, because of the fresh mental vigor and the political capacity of the invaders. The consequences, direct and indirect, of the Arabian invasion were mixed, and it would be difficult to make an appraisement of its net effects. The results of the Turanian irruption, on the other hand, were almost wholly disastrous, as we shall learn, to European civilization. The growth of the promising Russian nation was checked, while all the countries and races of Southeastern Europe were subjected for centuries to the degrading domination of a race alien in blood, in social institutions, in moral ideals, and in religious belief. Indeed, some of the European lands thus inundated have remained submerged beneath Asiatic barbarism up to the present day.

This comparatively late invasion of Europe by Asiatic nomads is noteworthy especially for the reason that it was the most successful

[1] The Mongols and Turks belong to that great family of predominantly nomadic or pastoral tribes and nations variously designated as the Scythic, the Turanian, or the Ural-Altaic, and having the steppes of Central and Northern Asia as their chief original seat.

of all the attacks of Asia upon Europe during historic times, and the last conquest of European territory by an Asiatic race.

174. The Conquests of the Mongols. — It was about the time of the opening of the Crusades when the Mongols, cruel and untamed nomads bred on the steppes of Central and Eastern

FIG. 27. — HUT-WAGON OF THE MEDIÆVAL TARTARS. (From Yule's *Book of Ser Marco Polo*)

"The wandering Scyths who dwell
In latticed huts high-poised on easy wheels."

ÆSCHYLUS, *Prom. Vinct.*, 709–10; quoted by Yule

Asia, that nursery of conquering races, began to set up a new dominion among the various tribes of Mongolia. Their first great chieftain was Jenghiz Khan (1206–1227), the most terrible scourge that ever afflicted the human race. At the head of innumerable hordes composed largely of Turkish tribes, callous and pitiless in their slaughterings as though their victims belonged to another species than themselves, Jenghiz traversed with sword and torch a great part of Asia. He conquered all the northern part of China, and then turning westward overran Turkestan and Persia. Cities disappeared as he advanced; populous plains were transformed into silent deserts. Before death overtook him he had extended his authority to the Dnieper in Russia and to the valley of the Indus. Even in death he claimed his victims:

at his tomb forty maidens were slain that their spirits might go to serve him in the other world.

The vast domains of Jenghiz passed into the hands of his son Oktai (d. 1241), a worthy successor of the great conqueror. He pushed outwards still further the boundaries of the empire in the east as well as in the west of Asia, and made a threatening invasion into Europe. This western expedition was led by the celebrated Batu. A large part of Russia, Poland, and Hungary were overrun and devastated. The cities of Moscow, Kiev, Pesth, and

THE MONGOL EMPIRE UNDER JENGHIS KHAN AND HIS IMMEDIATE SUCCESSORS (thirteenth century)

The shaded area shows the countries either under the direct rule of the Mongols or tributary to them

many others were burned and their inhabitants slain. In the space of two or three terrible years (1238–1241) almost half of Europe was pitilessly ravaged. The inhabitants of the other half seemed to be stunned. They made no concerted efforts to check the progress of the invaders. They apparently regarded the

visitation as though it were some destructive convulsion of nature for which there was no help or remedy. Fortunately, just at this critical moment Oktai died. Batu was recalled to Asia, and the civilization of Western Europe escaped the threatened destruction.

One of the most noted of the successors of Oktai was Kublai Khan (1259–1294), who made Cambalu, the modern Peking, his royal seat, and there received ambassadors and visitors from all parts of the world. It was at the court of this prince that the celebrated Italian traveler Marco Polo resided many years and gained that valuable and quickening knowledge of the Far East which he communicated to Europe in his remarkable work of travels and observations.

Upon the death of Kublai Khan the immoderately extended and loosely knit empire fell into disorder and separated into many petty states. It was restored by Timur or Tamerlane (= *Timurlenk*, "Timur the lame," 1369–1405), a remote relative of Jenghiz Khan. He made Samarkand in Central Asia his capital and seems to have deliberately set about reducing the whole earth to obedience. He is said to have declared that "since God is one and hath no partner, therefore the vicegerent over the lands of the Lord must be one." His dominions came to embrace a great part of Asia.

Timur's immense empire crumbled to pieces after his death. His descendant Baber invaded India (1525) and established there what became known as the Kingdom of the Great Moguls. This Mongol state lasted over two hundred years, — until destroyed by the English in the eighteenth century. The magnificence of the court of the Great Moguls at Delhi and Agra is one of the most splendid traditions of the East. These foreign rulers gave India some of her finest architectural monuments. The mausoleum at Agra, known as the *Taj Mahal*, is one of the most beautiful structures in the world.[2]

[2] Wherever we find an upspringing of art and architecture under the Mongols we shall not be wrong in attributing it to the influence upon them of the civilizations with which they came in contact in China, Persia, India, and Western Asia. Their architects and artisans were generally furnished by the conquered races or by the cities of Western Europe.

175. Historical Results of the Mongol Outbreak. — Asia has never recovered from the terrible devastation wrought by the Mongol conquerors. Many districts swarming with life were swept clean of their population by these destroyers of the race and have remained to this day desolate as the tomb. But it is the relation of the Mongol eruption to the history of the West that chiefly concerns us at present. This revolution had significance for European history, as we have already intimated, almost



FIG. 28. — THE TAJ MAHAL AT AGRA. (From a photograph)

This magnificent monument was erected by the Mogul emperor Shah Jehan (1628–1658), for a favorite wife who died in 1631

solely on account of the Mongols having laid the yoke of their power for a long time — for about three centuries — upon the Eastern Slavs. This was some such calamity for Russia as the later conquests of the Ottoman Turks were for the lands of Southeastern Europe. This Tartar domination, as we shall learn, left deep and permanent traces upon the Russian character and upon Russian history (sec. 265).

But there was some good issuing out of so much evil. As a consequence of the establishment of the extended empire of the Mongols there was better communication on the land side between

Europe and Eastern Asia than had ever existed before or was destined to exist again until the construction in our own day of the Trans-Siberian Railroad. The way was long and wearisome but comparatively safe, and consequently it was traversed back and forth by embassies between the European courts and the Mongol potentates, and by missionary-monks, artisans, merchants, and explorers. Marco Polo is the type and symbol of it all. Through this means there were brought into Europe from the Far East various arts, ideas, and inventions which undoubtedly contributed to the revival of culture in the West and to the inauguration of a new age for the European peoples.

II. The Ottoman Turks

176. The Beginnings of the Ottoman Empire. — The latest, most permanent, and most important historically of all the Turanian sovereignties was that established by the Ottoman Turks. The first appearance of this folk upon the arena of history was dramatic, and prophetic of their conquering career. About the middle of the thirteenth century a chieftain, accompanied by a band of several hundred horsemen, was riding over the hills of Anatolia (Asia Minor) in the neighborhood of Angora. Unexpectedly the wanderers came upon a battle in full progress, — battles were to be found almost anywhere in those days in those parts. The cavaliers, through sheer love of a fight, for they were totally ignorant alike of who the combatants were and why they thus fought together, dashed into the thickest of the battle, chivalrously taking the part of the weaker and yielding side and quickly turning the fight in its favor. It developed that the "beneficiaries of their chivalrous act" were Seljuk Turks forming the army of the sultan of Iconium. The grateful sultan invited the strangers to abide among his people and offered them lands for their flocks. They accepted the invitation, and the settlement thus formed became the nucleus of the great Ottoman Empire.[3]

[3] Creasy, *History of the Ottoman Turks*, chap. i.

The name of the hero of this story was Ertoghrul. The empire, the germ of which he planted, bears however not his name but that of his son Othman,[4] for the reason that the son was the first to assume in the new land the rank of an independent ruler.

Gradually the Ottoman princes subjected to their rule the various surrounding tribes which the Mongolian conquests had crowded westward into Asia Minor, and at the same time seized upon province after province of the Asiatic possessions of the Byzantine emperors. During the reign of Amurath I (1360–1389) a large part of the regions that came to be known as Turkey in Europe fell into their hands.

177. **The Janizaries.** — The conquests of the Turks were greatly aided by a remarkably efficient body of soldiers known as the Janizaries, which was organized early in the fourteenth century. This select corps was composed at first of the fairest children of Christian captives. When war ceased to furnish recruits, the sultans levied a tribute of children on their Christian subjects. At one time this tribute amounted to two thousand boys yearly. This method of recruiting the corps was maintained for about three hundred years. The boys, who were generally received at the age of about eight, were brought up in the Mohammedan faith and carefully trained in military service. These "infant proselytes of war" formed a military body that was one of the chief instruments in the creation of the Ottoman Empire.

178. **The Ottoman Advance checked by the Mongols.** — Amurath I was followed by Bajazet I (1347–1403), the rapid advance of whose conquests spread the greatest alarm throughout Central and Western Europe. The warriors of Hungary, Poland, and France gathered to arrest the menacing progress of the barbarians; but the allied army, numbering a hundred thousand men, was cut to pieces by the sabers of the Turks on the fatal field of Nicopolis, in Bulgaria (1396). Thousands of the knights and common soldiers who were made prisoners were barbarously and deliberately massacred by their captors.

[4] Othman I (1288–1326), or Osman, whence not only "Ottoman," but "Osmanlis," the favorite name which the Turks apply to themselves.

The unfortunate issue of this terrible battle threw all the West into a perfect panic of terror. Bajazet vowed that his horse "should eat oats on the high altar of St. Peter's in Rome," and there seemed no power in Christendom to prevent the sacrilege. Before proceeding to fulfill this threat, Bajazet turned back to capture Constantinople, which he believed in the present despondent state of its inhabitants would make little or no resistance.

Now just at this time Tamerlane was leading his hordes on their career of conquest. He directed them against the Turks in Asia Minor, and Bajazet was forced to raise the siege of Constantinople and hasten across the Bosporus to check the advance of these new enemies. The Turks and Mongols met upon the plains of Angora, where the former suffered a disastrous defeat (1402). This checked for a time the conquests of the Ottomans and saved Constantinople to Christendom for another period of fifty years.

179. The Fall of Constantinople (1453). — The Ottomans, however, gradually recovered from the blow given them by the Mongols. By the year 1421 they were strong enough to make another attempt upon Constantinople. The city was this time saved by the strength of its defenses. Another quarter of a century passed. Then finally, in the year 1453, Mohammed II the Great (1451–1480) laid siege to the capital with a vast army and fleet. The walls of the city were manned by a mere handful of men. After a short investment the place was taken by storm. The heroic Emperor, Constantine Palæologus, refusing to live "an Emperor without an Empire," fell sword in hand. Of the hundred thousand inhabitants of the capital forty thousand are said to have been slain and fifty thousand made slaves. The Cross, which since the time of Constantine the Great had surmounted the dome of St. Sophia, was replaced by the Crescent.

Thus fell New Rome into the hands of the barbarians of the East almost an exact millennium after Old Rome had passed into the possession of the barbarians of the West. Its fall was one of the most harrowing and fate-laden events in history. As Mohammed, like Scipio at Carthage, gazed upon the ruined city and the empty palace of Constantine, he is said, impressed by the

mutability of fortune, to have repeated musingly the lines of the Persian poet Firdusi: "The spider's web is the curtain in Cæsar's palace; the owl is the sentinel on the watchtower of Afrasiab." [5]

180. **The Ottomans checked by the Hungarians and the Knights of Rhodes.** — The consternation which the fall of New Rome created throughout Christendom was like the dismay which filled the world upon the downfall of Old Rome in the fifth century.

THE EMPIRE OF THE OTTOMAN TURKS ABOUT 1464

Europe now lay open to the invaders. The warriors of Hungary, however, made a valiant stand against them and succeeded in checking their advance upon the continent, while the Hospitalers (sec. 143), now established in the island of Rhodes, held them in restraint in the Mediterranean. Before the end of the sixteenth century the conquering energy of the Ottomans had about spent itself, and their empire had attained its greatest extent.

The Turks have ever remained quite insensible to the influences of European civilization, and their rule has been a perfect blight and curse to the Christian races subjected to their authority. They

[5] Afrasiab is the name of a personage who figures in the historical legends of Persia.

have always been looked upon as intruders in Europe, and their presence there has led to several of the most sanguinary wars of modern times. Gradually they are being pushed out from their European possessions, and the time is probably not remote when they will be driven back across the Bosporus, just as the Moslem Moors were expelled long ago from the opposite corner of the continent by the Christian chivalry of Spain.



FIG. 29. — RUINS OF THE GREAT MOSQUE AT SAMARKAND
(From Shoemaker, *The Heart of the Orient*)

This stupendous structure dates from the time of Tamerlane

Selections from the Sources. — *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, 2 vols. (trans. by Henry Yule). The best part of these volumes is condensed in NOAH BROOKS, *The Story of Marco Polo*. Marco Polo resided seventeen years at the court of Kublai Khan at Cambalu, the modern Peking. He saw the Mongol court at the time of its greatest brilliancy and gave Europe a vivid description of what he observed and heard in an account which our growing knowledge of the Farther East is giving a constantly higher reputation for accuracy and honesty.

Secondary Works. — HOWORTH, *History of the Mongols from the Ninth to the Nineteenth Century*. The best and most comprehensive work on the subject. CREASY, *History of the Ottoman Turks*, chaps. i–vi. GIBBON, *The Decline and Fall*, chaps. lxiv–lxviii. MIJATOVICH, *Constantine, the Last Emperor of the Greeks; or the Conquest of Constantinople by the Turks (A.D. 1453)*. The best account in English. POOLE, *The Story of Turkey*, chaps. i–vii. OMAN, *The Story of the Byzantine Empire*, chaps. xxv and xxvi. FREEMAN, *The Ottoman Power in Europe*, chaps. i–iv.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Marco Polo at the Mongol court. 2. Timur the Lame. 3. The Mongols in Russia. 4. The Janizaries. 5. The siege and capture of Constantinople by the Turks.

CHAPTER XV

THE GROWTH OF THE TOWNS

181. The Barbarians and the Roman Cities. — The old Roman towns, as points of attack and defense, suffered much during the period of the barbarian invasions. When the storm had passed, many of the once strong-walled towns lay "rings of ruins" on the wasted plains. Rome, during the Gothic wars, was for a time without a living soul within its walls. In Britain a considerable part of the Roman towns seem to have been virtually wiped out of existence by the Anglo-Saxon invaders. In Southern France, in Italy, and in Spain the cities on the whole suffered less; yet in none of the countries where they had sprung up and flourished under the shelter of the Roman rule did they wholly escape hurt and harm.

But it was not alone the violence of the destroyers of the Empire that brought so many cities to ruin. What chiefly caused their depopulation and decay was the preference of the barbarians for the open country to the city. As we have already learned, they had no liking for life within city walls. Hence it was inevitable that under the influence of the invasion, city life, speaking generally, should give place to country life. Up to the eleventh century the population of Europe was essentially a rural population like that of Russia to-day.

182. Rapid Development of the Cities in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries. — But just as soon as the invaders had settled down and civilization had begun to revive, the old Roman towns began gradually to assume somewhat of their former importance, and new ones to spring up in those provinces where they had been swept away, and in the countries outside of the limits of the ancient Empire.

During the tenth century Western Europe, it will be recalled, was terribly troubled by the Northmen, the Hungarians, and the Saracens (sec. 96). There being no strong central government, the cities, thrown upon their own resources for defense, sometimes with and sometimes without royal or imperial sanction, armed their militia, perfected their municipal organization, and above all else surrounded themselves with walls. Strong walls were the only sure protection in those evil times. Thus Europe became



FIG. 30. — THE AMPHITHEATER AT ARLES IN MEDIÆVAL TIMES
(From Smith, *The Troubadours at Home*)

"The amphitheater was made a fortress, packed with houses, in the eighth century, on account of Saracen incursions"

thickset with strong-walled cities, the counterpart of the castles of the feudal lords, which were the defense of the country-side.

183. The Towns enter the Feudal System; their Revolt. — When feudalism took possession of Europe the cities became a part of the system. They became vassals and suzerains. As vassals, they were of course subjected to all the incidents of feudal ownership.[1] They owed allegiance to their suzerain, were

[1] At first each householder in a town was a tenant of the lord of the fief, and was individually liable to him for rents or military service; but later many of the towns as towns, that is, as corporate bodies, became responsible for the rents and services due the lord. It was not until the towns came to act in their corporate capacity that they became an important factor in the political system.

he baron, prince, prelate, king, or emperor, and must pay him feudal tribute and aid him in his war enterprises.

As the cities, through their manufactures and trade, were the most wealthy members of the feudal system, the lords naturally looked to them for money when in need. Their demands and exactions at last became unendurable, and a long struggle broke out between them and the burghers, which resulted in what is known as the enfranchisement of the towns.

It was in the eleventh century that this revolt of the cities against the feudal lords became general. The burghers by this time had made their walls strong and had learned to fight, — if indeed they had ever forgotten that art. They became bold enough to defy their lord, — to shut their gates in the face of his tax-gatherer, and even in the face of the lord himself, even though he were king or emperor, when he came to parley with them. The contest lasted two centuries and more.

FIG. 31. — A COUNT AND HIS WIFE GRANTING A CHARTER TO A CITY. (From a fifteenth-century manuscript; after *Lacroix*)

The advantage in the end rested with the burghers. In process of time the greater number of the towns of the countries of Western Europe either bought with money, which was the usual mode of enfranchisement of English and German cities, or wrested by force of arms charters from their lords or suzerains. Many lords, however, of their own free will gave charters to the towns within their fiefs, granting them various exemptions and privileges, for the

reason that this fostered their growth and prosperity and made them more profitable vassals and tenants.

In many cases the charters simply defined the ancient customs and privileges of the favored towns and guaranteed them against unreasonable and arbitrary demands on the part of their lord. Even this, however, was a great gain; and as, under the protection of their charters, the cities grew in wealth and population, many of them in some countries became at last strong enough to cast off all actual dependence upon lord or king, became in effect independent states, — little commonwealths. Especially was this true in the case of the Italian cities, and in a less marked degree in the case of some of the German towns. Respecting the fortunes of the cities in these two countries we shall speak with some detail in later paragraphs.

184. **The Industrial Life of the Towns; the Gilds.** — The towns were the workshops of the later Middle Ages. The most noteworthy characteristics of their industrial life are connected with certain corporations or fraternities known as gilds. There were two chief classes of these, the gild merchant and the craft gilds. The gild merchant appears in the towns as soon as their commercial life becomes in any way active, that is to say, about the eleventh century. The members of the fraternity, speaking generally, were the chief landowners and traders of the place, and in many towns the city government was more or less completely in their hands.

Later, as trade developed, the craftsmen began to form separate fellowships on the model of the earlier society. We hear of unions of the shoemakers, the bakers, the weavers, the spinners, the dyers, the millers, and so on to the end. In some cities there were upwards of fifty of these associations.

No sooner had these plebeian societies grown strong than, in many of the Continental cities, they entered into a bitter struggle with the patrician gild merchant for a share in the municipal government or for participation in its trade monopoly. This conflict, in some of its features, reminds us of that between patrician and plebeian in ancient Rome. It lasted for two

centuries and more, — the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries mark the height of the struggle on the Continent, — and during all this time filled the towns with strenuous confusion. The outcome, speaking in general terms, was the triumph of the craftsmen.

The internal history of the towns during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is very largely the story of the gilds in their manifold activities. This story, however, it is impossible to give even in outline in our short space. We must content ourselves with having merely indicated the place of these interesting fraternities in the life of the mediæval towns.

185. The Hanseatic League. — When, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the towns of Northern Europe began to extend their commercial connections, the greatest drawback to their trade was the insecurity and disorder that everywhere prevailed. The trader who intrusted his goods to the overland routes was in danger of losing them at the hands of the robber nobles, who watched all the lines of travel and either robbed the merchant outright or levied an iniquitous toll upon his goods. Nor was the way by sea beset with less peril. Piratical crafts scoured the waters and made booty of any luckless merchantman they might overpower or lure to wreck upon the dangerous shores.

Finally, about the middle of the thirteenth century, some of the German cities, among which Lübeck and Hamburg were prominent, began to form temporary alliances for protecting their merchants against pirates and robbers. These transient leagues finally led to the formation of the celebrated Hanseatic[2] League, whose firm organization as a political power dates from near the middle of the fourteenth century. The confederation came to embrace eighty or more — the number is uncertain — of the principal towns of North Germany. The league organized armies, equipped navies, and exercised all the powers of sovereignty. It was "mediæval Germany on the sea."

In order to facilitate the trading operations of its members, the league maintained in different foreign cities factories, magazines, inns, and chapels. These stations were somewhat like the

[2] From the old German *hansa*, a "confederation" or "union."

settlements established to-day by Europeans in the countries of the Far East. The most noted centers of the foreign trade of the confederation were the cities of Bruges, London, Bergen, Wisby, and Novgorod. The league thus became a vast monopoly, which endeavored to control in the interests of its own members the entire commerce of Northern Europe.

186. **Causes of the Dissolution of the League.** — Numerous causes concurred to undermine the prosperity of the Hansa towns

THE HANSA TOWNS AND THEIR CHIEF FOREIGN SETTLEMENTS

and to bring about the dissolution of the league. Most prominent among these was the development of the manufactures and trade of the peoples whom the German merchants had for a time commercially subjected. The native traders now naturally became jealous of these foreigners, and the sovereigns of the land in which they had been allowed to establish settlements found it to their interest to annul the privileges formerly granted them and to encourage home industry and trade.

Another agency of disruption was the great maritime discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which transferred the centers of commercial activity as well from the Baltic

as from the Mediterranean ports to the harbors on the Atlantic seaboard. Finally, the Reformation and the accompanying religious wars in Germany, which brought many of the Hansa towns to utter ruin, completed the dissolution of the league.

187. Causes of the Early Growth of the Italian Cities. — But it was in Italy that the mediæval municipalities had their most remarkable development and acquired the greatest power and influence. A variety of circumstances and causes concurred in promoting their early and rapid growth.

First, these cities were the heirs of the great Roman past in a truer sense than were any of the towns outside of Italy. If in most of them no part of the actual machinery of the ancient municipal government was any longer in existence, still the inspiring memories and traditions of old-time liberties had not yet been forgotten.

Second, their political development was favored by the destruction of the unity of the peninsula by the Lombards (sec. 13). There being no strong central authority, the cities came naturally to assume large governmental responsibilities and to stand to one another in the relation of independent states.

Third, the weak development of feudalism in the peninsula favored the growth of the municipalities. The cities, instead of being brought in vassalage to the barons as happened almost everywhere else, brought the barons themselves into subjection. The lords, either through choice or by compulsion, became citizens of the towns. This absorption of the feudal nobility into the citizenship of the towns greatly strengthened them and contributed largely to the development of that diversity of life and that extraordinary energy of character which distinguished the inhabitants of these city-republics.

Fourth, the long struggle between the Papacy and the Empire tended greatly to enhance the liberties of the Italian cities. The Pope and Emperor were constantly bidding against each other for the help of the cities, — a situation which they took advantage of to make themselves practically independent of all superior control.

But the main direct cause of the material prosperity and indirectly of the political power of the most important of the Italian coast cities was their trade with the East, and the enormous impulse it received from the Crusades. Particularly did the merchants of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa become immensely rich through the vast transport business thrown into their hands by the crusading movement.

The political history of these Italian cities is very intricate and uninteresting; but their social, artistic, and commercial records form the most brilliant pages of the annals of the Middle Ages. There are, however, three important matters which may be considered as belonging to their general political history: (1) the formation of the Lombard League; (2) the dissensions of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; and (3) the rise of despots in the cities. We shall speak of each of these matters under a separate head, and then shall proceed to notice some of the more interesting and instructive circumstances in the separate commercial or intellectual life of the representative states of Venice, Genoa, and Florence.

188. **The Lombard League.** — As we have previously noticed, a great crisis in the history of the Italian cities was reached when Frederick Barbarossa became Emperor (sec. 162). Frederick held very lofty views of the Empire and its providential place in the government of the world, so that not merely a very natural ambition but conceptions of duty caused him to maintain unyieldingly the imperial rights. He was influenced doubtless by the civil lawyers who just now were engaging with great enthusiasm in the study of the old Roman law. Now this law had made the authority of the Emperor over the cities of the Empire virtually absolute. It was very natural then that Frederick, under the influence of the jurists, should have persuaded himself that the Italian cities had been making encroachments upon the imperial authority, and that it would be right for him to resume the power which his immediate predecessors had allowed to slip out of their hands. He would rule as had Justinian, Charlemagne, and Otto I. With Frederick entertaining such conceptions of the imperial

prerogatives, a struggle between him and the Italian cities was inevitable. To them his claims meant tyranny; to him theirs meant license and anarchy. Consequently, when Frederick attempted to place his own judges in the towns, to take away from them the right of waging private war, and to place other restrictions upon them, there came an armed conflict which lasted for thirty years. We may say of this war between the Emperor and his city vassals, as has been said of our late Civil War, that it was fought to get a definition of a constitution, — the unwritten constitution of the Holy Roman Empire.

Frederick repeatedly descended into Italy with an army to enforce his authority, and captured and burned several of the cities of Lombardy. At last the powerful city of Milan, which had heroically withstood his arms, fell into his hands. He scattered its inhabitants in villages, after the old Greek fashion of destroying a city, and razed to the ground its walls and buildings (1162).

A confederation known as the Lombard League was now formed by the exiled Milanese and a large number of the cities of Northern Italy for the purpose of avenging the wrongs of Milan and resisting the Emperor's pretensions. The banded cities stood firm for their cherished liberties. Finally, on the field of Legnano, in 1176, the Milanese and their allies, rallying around the sacred *carroccio*,[3] inflicted upon the imperial army an overwhelming defeat. A truce of six years was the prelude to the Peace of Constance (1183). By this agreement the Emperor's authority over the cities was reduced virtually to a titular and idle suzerainty,[4] while their right to manage their own internal affairs and to wage private war was acknowledged.

[3] In the eleventh century Heribert, Archbishop of Milan, invented for that city an ensign consisting of a pole bearing the crucifix and raised on a chariot, — hence called the *carroccio*. The car was drawn by four yokes of oxen and was, like the ancient Ark of the Israelites, of which it was a sort of imitation, the rallying point of the army on the battlefield. Many of the other cities followed the example of Milan, and under these curious standards, "the sign and symbol of all they held dear," the Italian cities marched in their short but brilliant career of freedom.

[4] The Emperor retained the right to place representatives in the cities and to receive food, forage, and lodging for his army when he might chance to visit Italy.

189. Dissensions among the Italian Cities; the Age of Liberty. — The cities had preserved or rather recovered their liberties. They had secured at Constance confirmation particularly of the cherished right of private war. This was a fatal privilege. They misused it and brought upon themselves no end of trouble and suffering. For a century and more they waged ever-renewed, bitter, and sanguinary wars upon one another.

The causes of dissension were many and near at hand. "The cities fought," says Symonds, "for command of seaports, passes, rivers, roads, and all the avenues of wealth and plenty." But besides the numerous causes of strife between the different republics, there were elements of discord within the walls of each individual city. The struggle between the Papacy and the Empire, in which the Italians perforce took part, divided the population of each town into two parties, — the Ghibellines, who adhered to the Emperor, and the Guelphs,[5] who espoused the cause of his enemy, the Pope. The history of civil dissensions might be searched in vain for a parallel to the bitterness and vindictiveness with which the struggle between these parties was carried on for centuries.

Still another very fruitful source of disorder and violence in the cities was the presence there of the feudal lords (sec. 187). In other lands these quarrelsome folk fought out their feuds in the open country; in Italy, in the streets of the cities.

Nevertheless, though fraught with so many evils, "Liberty," as declares Herodotus in speaking of democratic Athens, "Liberty is a brave thing." The strenuous freedom of the Italian cities fostered great talents and great virtues in their citizens. The eminent Florentine historian Guicciardini attributes the prosperity and brilliant culture of the Italian cities during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to the local independence they then enjoyed.

190. The Rise of Despots. — The constant wars of the Italian cities with each other and the incessant strife of parties within

[5] These names, which were of German origin, became at last mere party shibboleths. Speaking in a very general way, it may be said that the Ghibellines represented the intrusive Teutonic element and favored a feudal, aristocratic organization of society, while the Guelphs represented the old Roman population and were supporters of liberal democratic institutions.

each community led to the same issue as that to which tended the endless contentions and divisions of the Greek cities in ancient times. Their democratic institutions were overthrown, internecine war and strife having resulted in anarchy, and anarchy having led, as always, to tyranny.

By the end of the thirteenth century almost all the republics of Northern and Central Italy down to the papal states, save Venice, Genoa, and the cities of Tuscany, had fallen into the hands of domestic tyrants, many of whom by their crimes and their intolerable tyranny rendered themselves as odious as the worst of the tyrants who usurped supreme power in the free cities of ancient Hellas. They possessed, many of them, a remarkable "energy for crime." Their strenuous wickedness filled the land with violence and terror.

One thing which enabled these usurpers to seize the supreme power in the cities was the decay of the military spirit in their inhabitants. The burghers became immersed in business and delegated the defense of their cities to mercenaries. The captains of these hirelings were known as *condottieri*. Some of them were foreign adventurers; all were soldiers of fortune. They found it easy to overthrow the liberties of the cities which they had been hired to defend.

We shall now relate some circumstances, for the most part of a commercial or social character, which concern some of the most renowned of the Italian city-states.

191. Venice. — Venice, the most famous of the Italian cities, had its beginnings in the fifth century in the rude huts of some refugees who fled out into the marshes of the Adriatic to escape the fury of the Huns of Attila. Here, secure from the pursuit of the barbarians, who were unprovided with boats, they gradually built up, on some low islets, a number of little villages, which finally, towards the close of the seventh century, coalesced to form a single city, at whose head was placed a ruler bearing the title of Duke, or Doge, a name destined to acquire a wide renown.

Conquests and negotiations gradually extended century after century the possessions of the island republic, until she finally

came to control the coast and waters of the Eastern Mediterranean in much the same way that Carthage had mastery of the Western Mediterranean at the time of the First Punic War. Even before the Crusades her trade with the East was very extensive, and by those expeditions was expanded into enormous dimensions. The sea between Italy and the ports of Egypt and Syria was whitened with the sails of her transports and war galleys. It will be recalled that she took part in the Fourth Crusade, which resulted in the capture of Constantinople by the Latin Christians (sec. 148). As her share of the divided lands of the Eastern Empire she received the Peloponnesus, most of the Greek islands, and the shore lands of the Hellespont, — a goodly empire of the sea.

FIG. 32. — STATE BARGE OF VENICE USED IN THE CEREMONY OF "WEDDING THE ADRIATIC." (From a model preserved in the Venetian Arsenal; after *Lacroix*)

Venice was at the height of her power during the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. Her supremacy on the Mediterranean Sea, which was as complete as is England's on the ocean to-day, was celebrated each year by the unique ceremony of "Wedding the Adriatic" by the dropping of a ring into the sea. The origin of this custom was as follows. In the year 1177 Pope Alexander III, out of gratitude to the Venetians for services rendered him in his quarrel with the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, gave a ring to the Doge with these words: "Take this as a token of dominion over the sea, and wed her every year, you and your successors forever, in order that all may know that the sea belongs to Venice and is subject to her as a bride is subject to her husband." This annual celebration of the ceremony was one of the most brilliant spectacles of the Middle Ages.

The maritime power and ascendancy of Venice was embodied in her famous Arsenal. This consisted of a series of wharves,

dockyards, and vast magazines filled with marine war-engines and military stores of every kind. In the city's palmiest day sixteen thousand shipbuilders, workmen, and guards were employed here. The Arsenal was one of the sights of Europe and is still an object of interest to the curious traveler. Dante introduced in his *Inferno*[6] a celebrated description of the place, doubtless from personal knowledge of it.

The decline of Venice dates from the fifteenth century. The conquests of the Ottoman Turks during this century deprived her of much of the territory she held east of the Adriatic, and finally the discovery of the New World by Columbus and of an unbroken water route to India by Vasco da Gama gave a deathblow to her commerce. From this time on the trade with the East was to be conducted from the Atlantic ports instead of from those in the Mediterranean.



FIG. 33. — A CANAL IN VENICE. (From a photograph)

192. Genoa. — Genoa, on the old Ligurian coast, was after Venice the most powerful of the Italian maritime cities. She early crushed her near competitor Pisa,[7] and then entered into a fierce competition with Venice for the control of the trade of the Orient.

The period of Genoa's greatest prosperity dates from the recapture of Constantinople from the Latins by the Greeks in

[6] Canto xxi, 7–19.

[7] Pisa is located a little to the south of Genoa, on the same coast. The first battle between the navies of the two republics was fought in 1070. Thenceforward for two centuries the rival cities were engaged in an almost continuous war, which finally resulted in the complete destruction of the power of Pisa.

1261. Through jealousy of the Venetians, the Genoese assisted the Greeks in the recovery of Constantinople and in return were given various commercial privileges in places along the Bosporus. Very soon they established stations upon the shores of the Euxine and began to carry on a lucrative trade with Eastern Asia by way of the Black Sea and the Caspian.

The jealousy with which the Venetians regarded the prosperity of the Genoese led to oft-renewed war between the two rival republics. For nearly two centuries their hostile fleets contended, as did the navies of Rome and Carthage, for the supremacy of the sea. In the year 1380 Venice inflicted upon her rival a terrible naval defeat which crippled her permanently.

The final blow to Genoa's prosperity, however, was given by the irruption into Europe of the Mongols and the Ottoman Turks, and the capture of Constantinople by the latter in 1453 (sec. 179). The Genoese traders were now driven from the Black Sea, and their traffic with Eastern Asia was completely broken up; for the Venetians had control of the ports of Egypt and Syria and the southern routes to India and the countries beyond, — that is, the routes by way of the Euphrates and the Red Sea.

193. **Florence.** — Florence, "the most illustrious and fortunate of Italian republics," although from her inland location upon the Arno shut out from engaging in those naval enterprises that conferred wealth and importance upon the coast cities of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa, became, notwithstanding, through the skill, industry, enterprise, and genius of her citizens, the great manufacturing, financial, literary, and art center of the later mediæval centuries. The list of her illustrious citizens, of her poets, statesmen, historians, architects, sculptors, and painters is more extended than that of any other city of mediæval times; and indeed, as respects the number of her great men, Florence is perhaps unrivaled by any city of the ancient or modern world save Athens. In her long roll of fame we find the names of Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Machiavelli, Michael Angelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Galileo, Amerigo Vespucci, and the Medici.

PLATE III. — VIEW OF FLORENCE, ITALY, ABOUT THE YEAR 1490. (From a contemporary woodcut; after Geiger, *Renaissance und Humanismus*)

About the beginning of the fifteenth century Florence fell into the hands of the celebrated Medici,[8] a Florentine family that had grown rich and powerful through mercantile enterprises. These usurpers of liberty were fortunately enlightened despots and made their rule generally acceptable to the Florentines through a munificent patronage extended to artists and scholars, an unstinted liberality in the prosecution of magnificent public works, and the glory they shed upon Florence by the maintenance of a brilliant court.

194. Services to Civilization of the Mediæval Towns. — Modern civilization inherited much from each of the three great centers of mediæval life, — the monastery, the castle, and the town. We have noticed what came out of cloister and of baronial hall, what the monk and what the baron contributed to civilization.[9] We must now see what came out of the town, what contribution the burgher made to European life and culture.

In the first place, the mediæval cities bequeathed to modern times certain valuable economic ideals and principles. It was in the heart of these communities, as within the early Benedictine monasteries, that labor, almost for the first time in history, if we except the teachings and practices of the Hebrews, was emancipated and the stigma put upon it by slavery and serfdom removed.[10] In the cities of ancient Greece and Italy, speaking generally, trading, save in a large way, and all manual employments were given over into servile hands; a citizen engaging in business was in some cases punished by being deprived of his citizenship, since he was regarded as having dishonored himself, or, in the words of Plato, as having "thrown dirt on his father's house."[11] In the mediæval towns, on the contrary, it was a very

[8] The two most distinguished names of the house are those of Cosimo de' Medici (1389–1464), who was called the "Friend of the People and the Father of his Country," and Lorenzo, his grandson (1448–1492), who had bestowed upon him the title of "The Magnificent."

[9] See secs. 32 and 101.

[10] Serfdom was early extinguished in the towns, which became one of the most powerful agencies, both through direct action and indirect influence, in the abolition of rural serfdom.

[11] "He who in any way shares in the illiberality of retail trades may be indicted by any one who likes for dishonoring his race, before those who are judged to be first in

general rule that only the members of the merchant and craft gilds could have lot and part in the municipal government. This meant that here labor had ceased to be servile and was coming to be looked upon, at least by the laborers themselves, as honorable. This new feeling regarding labor the towns



FIG. 34. — THE COLOGNE CATHEDRAL. (From a photograph)

This edifice was begun in the eleventh century, but was not finished until our own day (1880). It is one of the most imposing monuments of Gothic architecture in the world

transmitted to the Modern Age. This was one of the most precious elements of their great bequest.

In the second place, the towns were the cradle of modern commerce, that is of trade on a large scale between widely separated cities and lands. It was through the activity and enterprise of

virtue; and if he appear to throw dirt upon his father's house by an unworthy occupation, let him be imprisoned for a year and abstain from that sort of thing."— *Laws*, xi. 919 (Jowett's trans.). So also Aristotle. Speaking of the state which is best governed, he says: "The citizens . . . must not lead the life of mechanics or tradesmen, for such life is ignoble and inimical to virtue." — *Politics*, vii. 9 (Jowett's trans.).

the mediæval merchant and trader that was laid the basis of that vast system of international exchange and traffic which forms so characteristic a feature of modern European civilization.

In the third place, the mediæval cities, along with the monasteries, were the foster home of architecture, sculpture, and painting. These things, as has been well said, are "the beautiful flowers of free city life." The old picturesque high-gabled houses, the sculptured gild halls, the artistic gateways, the superb palaces, and the imposing cathedrals found in so many of the cities of Europe to-day bear witness to the important place which the mediæval towns hold in the history of architecture and art.[12]

FIG. 35. — TOWN HALL OF LOUVAIN
(After *Lübke*)
This magnificent Gothic edifice dates from the fifteenth century

In the fourth place, the towns were the birthplace of modern political liberty. They became such through giving society a new order at a time when political society was made up of orders. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries there were only two classes, or orders, in the state which had participation in the government, — the nobility and the clergy. The inhabitants of the towns

[12] The enthusiasm for church building was most marked in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The style of architecture first employed was the Romanesque, characterized by the rounded arch and the dome; but towards the close of the twelfth century this was superseded by the Gothic, distinguished by the pointed arch, the slender spire, and rich ornamentation.

grew into a new order destined to a great political future, the so-called *Third Estate*, or *Commons*.[13] During the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the representatives of the towns came to sit along with the nobles and the clergy in the national diets or parliaments of the different countries.[14] What this meant for the development of modern parliamentary government we shall learn later.

In the fifth place, it was the most typical of the free cities, those of Italy, which gave to the world the Renaissance, that great essentially intellectual movement which marked the latter part of the Middle Ages. The relation of the Italian cities to this mental awakening will be made the subject of a section further on (sec. 279).

Selections from the Sources. — LEE, *Source-Book*, § 56, "Charter of the City of London (from Henry I)." COLBY, *Selections*, p. 70, "A Town Charter." *Translations and Reprints*, vol. ii, No. 1, "English Towns and Gilds" (ed. by Edward P. Cheyney). *European History Studies* (Univ. of Nebraska), vol. ii, Nos. 8 and 9, "The Rise of Cities" and "The Trades of Paris." ROBINSON, *Readings in European History*, vol. i, chap. xviii (in part).

Secondary Works. — GUIZOT, *History of Civilization in Europe*, Lect. vii, "Rise of the Free Cities." GREEN, *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century*. GROSS, *The Gild Merchant*. The best authority on the subject it covers. ZIMMERN, *The Hansa Towns*. SYMONDS, *Age of the Despots*, chaps. iii and iv. HAZLITT, *The Venetian Republic*. The standard authority in English. WEIL, *Venice*, chaps. i–xii. DUFFY, *The Tuscan Republics* (*Florence*, *Siena*, *Pisa*, *and Lucca*) *with Genoa*. EMERTON, *Mediæval Europe*, chap. xv (last part). ADAMS, *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. xii, "The Growth of Commerce and its Results." CHEYNEY, *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England*, chaps. iii and iv. MUNRO and SELLERY, *Mediæval Civilization*, pp. 358–365. MRS. OLIPHANT, *Makers of Venice*. In the "Mediæval Towns" series there are separate volumes on Florence, Nuremberg, Bruges, etc., which contain chapters of interest.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The Gilds. 2. Frederick Barbarossa and Milan. 3. The *carroccio*. 4. A typical Italian despot. See Symond's *Age of the Despots*. 5. The Wedding of the Adriatic. 6. The Venetian Arsenal. 7. St. Mark's at Venice. 8. Cathedral building.

[13] In England the men of the rural districts, that is of the counties, formed from the first, or almost from the first, a part of this order. In other countries, however, it was not until a later time that the rural class came to reënforce the new estate.

[14] See secs. 211 and 236.

PLATE IV. — MILAN CATHEDRAL. (From a photograph)

CHAPTER XVI

THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE SCHOOLMEN

195. Introductory. — "History's true object of study," says Fustel de Coulanges, "is the human mind; it should aspire to know what this mind has believed, thought, and felt in the different ages of the life of the human race."

What we have narrated in preceding chapters respecting mediæval institutions and enterprises will have revealed to the thoughtful reader something at least of both the mind and the heart of the men of the Middle Ages. Nothing, however, mirrors more perfectly the purely intellectual life of those centuries than the universities which the age-spirit called into existence. For this reason we propose in the present chapter to say something of these institutions and of what was taught in them.

196. The Rise and Early Growth of the Universities. — It will be recalled that a significant feature of the work of Charlemagne was the establishment of schools in connection with the cathedrals and monasteries of his realm (sec. 76). From the opening of the ninth till well on into the eleventh century the lamp of learning was fed in these episcopal and monastic schools, although throughout the tenth century the flame burned very low. Closely associated with these Church seminaries we find the names of many of the most influential men of the earlier mediæval centuries.

But towards the close of the eleventh and the opening of the twelfth century a new intellectual movement, which was destined to affect profoundly these schools, began to stir Western Christendom. This mental revival was caused by many agencies, particularly by the quickening influence of the Græco-Arabian culture in Spain and the Orient, with which the Christian West was just now being brought into closer contact through the Crusades.

As a consequence of this newly awakened intellectual life there arose a demand for more advanced and specialized instruction than that given in the cloister schools, and especially for a freer and more secular system of education, one that should prepare a person for entering upon a professional career as a physician, lawyer, or statesman.[1]

It was in response to these new demands that the universities came into existence. Their early history is very obscure for the reason that the most ancient ones, as Laurie says, "grew and were not founded." Some of these were mere expansions of cathedral or monastery schools; others developed out of lay schools which had grown up in commercial towns, especially in the Italian cities, and in which the instruction given was almost wholly secular in character and practical in aim.

The popes patronized the rising schools, "believing that all learning tended to the glory of God and the good of the Church"; emperors and kings granted them charters confirming their already acquired privileges, or granting them fresh immunities, in the expectation that they would prove a bulwark of the imperial or royal authority; cities fostered their growth for the sake of the distinction they conferred and the residents and trade they attracted.

It was about the end of the twelfth and the opening of the thirteenth century when the earliest universities were formally recognized by royal and papal charters. Three of the most ancient universities were the University of Salerno, noted for its teachers in medicine; the University of Bologna, frequented for its instruction in law; and the University of Paris, revered for the authority of its doctors in theology. Bologna and Paris served as models in organization and government for the most of the later universities. The University of Paris gave constitution and rules to so

[1] The number of faculties in the mediæval university was not fixed. A usual number was four, — the Faculty of Theology, the Faculty of Medicine, the Faculty of Law, and the Faculty of Arts (or Philosophy). The course in arts embraced what is to-day covered by the courses in letters and science, and served as a preparation for entrance upon one of the three specialized professional courses, though most of the students never went beyond it.

many as to earn the designation of "the Mother of Universities and the Sinai of the Middle Ages."

197. University Organization: the "Nations," or Gilds. — Many features of the mediæval university can be understood only in the light of the fact that in the mediæval town the alien was almost as wholly without rights, both political and civil, as was the alien in a city of ancient Greece, and that in case of most of the universities, not only the students, but the masters as well, were almost all noncitizens of the towns in which they gathered. Consequently, for the sake of comradeship, for mutual assistance and "the avenging of injuries," the students, either alone or in connection with their teachers, organized themselves, according to the countries whence they came, into associations or gilds, which came to be known as "Nations." At Paris there were four of these groups, at Bologna thirty-six.

It was these gilds which exercised or enjoyed the special rights and privileges to which we referred in the preceding paragraph. These privileges very generally included exemption from taxation, from military service, and freedom from the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts. The early universities thus became in a large measure self-governed and self-judged communities, in a word, "literary republics," holding some such relation to the civil authorities of the cities in which they were situated as many of these cities themselves, in the age of independent city life, held to the state.

198. Students and Student Life. — The number of students in attendance at the mediæval universities was large. Contemporaries tell of crowds of fifteen, twenty, and even thirty thousand at the most popular institutions. These numbers have been called in question, and it will be safe to consider them, like other mediæval figures, merely as "metaphors for immensity." But that the attendance was numerous is certain, for in those times all who were eager to acquire knowledge — and the intellectual ferment was general — must needs seek some seat of learning, since the scarcity and great cost of manuscript books put home study out of the question. Then, again, many of the pupils

attending the nonprofessional courses were mere boys of twelve or thereabouts, — the high-school pupils of to-day; while, on the other hand, the student body embraced many mature men, among whom were to be counted canons, deans, archdeacons, and other dignitaries.

Student life in the earlier university period, before the dormitory and college system was introduced, was unregulated and shamefully disorderly. The age was rough and lawless, and the

FIG. 36. — UNIVERSITY AUDIENCE IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY
(From Geiger's *Renaissance and Humanismus*)

student class were no better than their age; indeed, in some respects they seem to have been worse. For the student body included many rich young profligates, who found the universities the most agreeable places for idling away their time, as well as many wild and reckless characters who were constantly engaging in tavern brawls, terrorizing the townsmen at night, even waylaying travelers on the public roads, and committing "many other enormities hateful to God."

Between the students composing the different "Nations" there existed much race prejudice and animosity, which sometimes broke out in unseemly riots in the lecture room. The most serious feuds, however, arose between the students and the townsmen. "Town and gown" disagreements and fights were common and not unfrequently resulted in the migration to another city of the whole, or practically the whole, body of students and masters.

199. Branches of Study and Methods of Instruction. — The advanced studies given greatest prominence in the universities were the three professional branches of theology, medicine, and law. The natural sciences can hardly be said to have existed, although in alchemy lay hidden the germ of chemistry and in astrology that of astronomy. The Ptolemaic theory, which made the earth the stationary center of the revolving celestial spheres, gave color and form to all conceptions of the structure of the universe.

The method of instruction in all the university departments was the same. It was a servile study of texts, which were regarded with a veneration bordering on superstition and were minutely analyzed and commented upon. Thus in theology it was a study of the Bible and particularly of the writings of the Church Fathers and doctors; in medicine, an explanation of the works of Hippocrates and Galen with their Arabian commentators; in natural science, a study of the physics of Aristotle; in civil law, a commentary on the works of the *Corpus Juris* of Justinian, and in canon law, on the decisions and edicts of popes and councils. Not even in the physical sciences was there any serious appeal to experience, to observation, to experiment. In anatomy, discussions took the place of dissections.[2] Books were considered better authority than nature herself. "Aristotle," says Ueberweg, "was regarded as the founders of religions are wont to be considered." One venturing to criticise this "Master of those who know" was looked upon as presumptuous and irreverent.

This mode of study resulted in part from an imitation of the method followed in theology, which was perforce a study of

[2] At Bologna, where anatomical study was most advanced, each student witnessed only one dissection during the year.

texts held as authoritative or infallible; and in part from the lack of books, which made dictation by the teacher and note taking and memorizing by the student the only practicable mode of carrying on the work of the lecture room.

The ordinary classes met in private rooms or hired apartments. Mass meetings of the "Nations" and other large assemblages were held in some convenient cathedral or convent church borrowed for the occasion. The university itself had at first neither dormitories nor halls.[3]

200. Scholasticism; the Province of the Schoolmen. — Springing up within the early ecclesiastical schools and developed within the later universities, there came into existence a method of philosophizing which, from the place of its origin, was called Scholasticism, while its representatives were called Schoolmen, or Scholastics.

The chief task of the Schoolmen was the reducing of Christian doctrines to scientific form, the harmonizing of revelation and reason, of faith and science. They thought it possible to build up a science of theology which, like the science of geometry, should consist of indisputable theorems and corollaries resting upon a foundation of axioms and exact definitions. Their aim was to give every Christian doctrine a demonstration so complete and absolute as to compel the belief of everybody, — skeptics, pagans, and Saracens.

We should note that the typical Schoolmen did not question the truth or soundness of the doctrines and teachings of the Church. They did not ask, *Are* these things so? but simply, *How* and *why* are they so? Surely there must be a reason for everything, they insisted, and God has given us our reasoning faculty that we might search out reasons and causes.

201. The Earlier Schoolmen; Abelard. — John Scotus Erigena, an Irish teacher and philosopher, is sometimes called the first of

[3] It was this poverty of the university which rendered so easy those migrations or secessions of dissatisfied students and masters of which we hear so frequently. Nothing prevented them, if they felt themselves wronged by the local authorities, from fleeing from one city to another. Several of the younger universities originated in such movements.

the Schoolmen; but more generally this place is given to St. Anselm (1033–1109), abbot of the monastery of Bec in Normandy and later Archbishop of Canterbury in England.[4] The maxim of this typical Schoolman was: "I believe in order that I may understand."

But by far the most eminent of the early Schoolmen was Peter Abelard (1079–1142). Such a teacher the world had probably not produced since Socrates enchained the youth of Athens. At Paris over five thousand pupils are said to have thronged his lecture room. Driven by the shame of a public scandal and by persecution to seek retirement, he hid himself first in a monastery and later in a solitude near the city of Troyes. But his admirers followed him into the wilds in such multitudes that a veritable university sprang up around him in his desert retreat.

Abelard carried to an extreme the tendency of the Schoolmen to rationalize everything. "A doctrine is believed," he taught, "not because God has said it, but because we are convinced by reason that it is so." He declared doubt to be the starting point in the quest of knowledge, and, apparently with the object of producing this desirable state of mind in his disciples, wrote a book entitled *Sic et Non* ("So and Not So"), which was a collection of mutually contradictory opinions of the Church Fathers on every conceivable theological question.

The Church conservatives became frightened. Bernard of Clairvaux, preacher of the Second Crusade, entered the lists against the presumptuous champion of the human reason. Bernard's principle was that man acquires a knowledge of divine things by way of the heart and not by way of the intellect. "God is known," he finely said, "in proportion as he is loved." He charged Abelard with pride of intellect: "There is nothing in heaven or on earth," he said, "that he does not claim to know." He complained that no place was left for faith; the human reason usurped everything.

[4] With St. Anselm begins practically the great Scholastic controversy of the Nominalists and Realists which never wholly ceased in the mediæval schools. For an account of this prolonged discussion the student must have recourse to works on philosophy.

The temper of the times was against Abelard. Certain of his opinions were condemned by two Church councils, and he was forced to burn part of his writings. This was one of the most noteworthy collisions between ecclesiastical authority and freedom of thought during the Middle Ages.

Abelard's brilliant reputation as a philosopher was tarnished by grave faults of character. Intrusted with the education of a fascinating and mentally gifted maiden, Héloïse by name, Abelard betrayed the confidence reposed in him. A secret marriage bound in a tragic fate the lives of teacher and pupil. The "tale of Abelard and Héloïse" forms one of the most romantic yet saddest traditions of the twelfth century.

202. Scholasticism in the Thirteenth Century; Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. — The thirteenth century witnessed a fresh development of Scholasticism. The impulse to this renewed intellectual activity came to the Christian West, like many similar incitements, from ancient Greece. It came at this time through various channels, but mainly through the Arabian schools in Spain.

Before the end of the first quarter of the thirteenth century all the works of Aristotle were for the first time brought to the knowledge of the Schoolmen. Before this it was chiefly his logic which was known to them; but now all his other works were translated into Latin, at first from Arabic or Hebrew versions, and then later directly from the Greek text.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the stimulating influence of these fresh philosophical and scientific acquisitions upon the Christian thinkers of the West. The great age of Scholasticism now opened. The universities of Paris and Oxford were the chief centers of the new movement; the Mendicant Orders furnished its most illustrious representatives.

From the Dominican Order came Albertus Magnus, or "Albert the Great" (1193–1280), who was called "the second Aristotle," and Thomas Aquinas (1225 or 1227–1274), known as "the Angelic Doctor." As philosophers these Schoolmen stand to each other in some such relation as did Plato and Aristotle, nor

are their names unworthy of being linked with the names of those great thinkers of ancient Greece. The reputation of Aquinas as the greatest Scholastic and theologian of the Middle Ages rests largely upon his prodigious work entitled *Summa Theologiæ*, or "Sum of Theology."[5] The work is regarded as the standard of orthodoxy in the Catholic Church.

From the Franciscan Order came Duns Scotus (d. 1308), a British monk, whose keen analytical intellect caused him to be called "the Subtle Doctor." "The mind of Duns Scotus," says Dean Milman, "might seem a wonderful reasoning machine; whatever was thrown into it came out in syllogisms."

203. The Scientific Side of Scholasticism; Roger Bacon. — The typical Schoolman was a logician, and speculative subjects connected with theology were his supreme interest; yet there were some Schoolmen who devoted themselves largely to physical science, and sought to gain a knowledge of nature, not alone through books, but by direct personal observation and study of nature herself. The impulse to this study of the natural sciences was communicated to Christian scholars mainly through their contact with Greek and Arabian learning.

The most noteworthy representative of the scientific activity of the Scholastic age was the English Franciscan friar, Roger Bacon (d. 1294), called "the Wonderful Doctor," on account of his marvelous knowledge of mechanics, optics, chemistry, and other sciences. He understood the composition of gunpowder, or a similar explosive, and seemingly the nature of steam; for in one of his works he says that "wagons and ships could be built which would propel themselves with the swiftness of an arrow, without horses and without sails." His contemporaries believed him to be in league with the devil. He suffered persecution and was imprisoned for fourteen years.

[5] This was not the first attempt of the kind. In the twelfth century Peter of Lombard (d. 1164) wrote his famous *Four Books of Sentences*, which earned for him the title of "the Master of Sentences." This work, which served in some sort as a basis for the *Summa* by Aquinas, consisted mainly of a collection of short quotations from the writings of the Church Fathers and doctors. It was one of the most popular text-books ever written. It held its place in the schools as a manual of theology for more than three hundred years.

Roger Bacon's greatest bequest to posterity was a book called *Opus Majus*, in which is anticipated in a wonderful way those principles of modern inductive science laid down by Francis Bacon in the seventeenth century. "The advance of sound historical judgment," says Andrew D. White, "seems likely to bring the fame of the two who bear the name of Bacon nearly to equality."

204. The Last of the Schoolmen. — The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries witnessed the decline of Scholasticism. Scholastic debate in the hands of unworthy successors of the great philosophers of the thirteenth century fell away for the most part into barren disputations over idle and impossible questions. The representatives of this degenerate Scholasticism became the objects of the unmeasured scorn and ridicule of the men of the New Learning brought in by that revival of classical culture which marked the later mediæval age. The low estimation in which the Schoolmen of this period came to be held is disclosed in the history of our word *dunce*. Originally applied as an appellation of honor to a disciple of the great Duns or to any learned person, the term at this time, being ironically applied to the stupid Scholastic opposed to classical studies, came to acquire its present meaning of a preposterous dolt.

205. The Services of the Schoolmen to Intellectual Progress. — The Schoolmen fill a large place in the history of the intellectual development of the race. They rendered in this relation two distinct and important services.

In the first place, by their ceaseless debates and argumentation they stimulated to activity the mediæval intellect and disciplined it in the processes of exact reasoning. They made the universities of the time real mental gymnasia in which the European mind was trained and prepared for its later and, happily, more fruitful work.

In the second place, the Schoolmen rendered a great service to the cause of intellectual freedom. This assertion at first blush may appear paradoxical, when one recalls that the submission of reason to Church authority was one of the fundamental

maxims of the orthodox Schoolmen. But the place they gave the human reason and the constant appeal they made to it was preparing the way for the full and plain assertion of the principle of the freedom of thought. "Scholasticism as a whole," says Professor Seth, "may be justly regarded as the history of the growth and gradual emancipation of reason which was completed in the movements of the Renaissance and the Reformation."

Selections from the Sources. — *Translations and Reprints*, vol. ii, No. 3, "The Mediæval Student" (ed. by Dana Carleton Munro). HENDERSON, *Select Historical Documents*, pp. 262–266, "The Foundation of the University of Heidelberg, A.D. 1386." DANTE, *Divina Commedia* (trans. by Longfellow). There is much of the spirit, the form, and the substance of Scholasticism in this great mediæval poem, for, after Aristotle, the Schoolmen Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas were Dante's masters in philosophy and science. An admirable bit of Scholastic reasoning and exposition will be found in canto vii of the *Paradiso*, where Beatrice discourses on "the Incarnation, the Immortality of the soul, and the Resurrection of the body."

Secondary Works. — RASHDALL, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*. LAURIE, *The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities*. COMPAYRÉ, *Abelard, and the Origin and Early History of Universities*. JESSOPP, *The Coming of the Friars*, chap. vi, "The Building up of a University." CHURCH, *Saint Anselm*. ALZOG, *Universal Church History*, vol. ii, pp. 728–784. FISHER, *History of the Christian Church*, pp. 208–226. STILLÉ, *Studies in Mediæval History*, chap. xiii. EMERTON, *Mediæval Europe*, chap. xiii. MORISON, *The Life and Times of Saint Bernard*, and STORRS, *Bernard of Clairvaux*. In each of these works will be found an interesting account of Bernard's controversy with Abelard. GALLIENNE, *Old Love Stories Retold*, "Abelard and Héloise." MULLINGER, *A History of the University of Cambridge*, chaps. i–iii. MUNRO and SELLERY, *Mediæval Civilization*, pp. 348–357. Consult also articles on "Universities" and "Scholasticism" in the *Encyc. Brit.*

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The "Nations" at the universities. 2. Student life. 3. "Town and gown." 4. Abelard and St. Bernard. 5. Albertus Magnus. 6. Thomas Aquinas. 7. Roger Bacon.

CHAPTER XVII

GROWTH OF THE NATIONS: FORMATION OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS AND LITERATURES

206. **Introductory.** — The most important political movement that marked the latter part of the Middle Ages was the fusion, in several of the countries of Europe, of the petty feudal principalities and half-independent cities and communes into great nations with strong centralized governments. This movement was accompanied by, or rather consisted in, the decline of feudalism as a governmental system, the loss by the cities of their freedom, and the growth of the power of the kings.

Many things contributed to this consolidation of peoples and governments, different circumstances favoring the movement in the different countries. In some countries, however, conditions were opposed to the centralizing tendency, and in these the Modern Age was reached without nationality having been found. But in England, in France, and in Spain circumstances all seemed to tend towards unity, and by the close of the fifteenth century there were established in these countries strong despotic monarchies. Yet even among those peoples where national governments did not appear, some progress was made towards unity through the formation of national languages and literatures, and the development of common feelings and aspirations, so that these races or peoples were manifestly only awaiting the opportunities of a happier period for the maturing of their national life.

This rise of monarchy and decline of feudalism, this substitution of strong centralized governments in place of the feeble, irregular, and conflicting rule of the feudal nobles or of other local authorities was a very great gain to the cause of law and good order. It paved the way for modern progress and civilization.

In these changes the political liberties of all classes, of the cities as well as of the nobility, were, it is true, subverted. But though Liberty was lost, Nationality was found. And the people may be trusted to win back freedom, as we shall see. Those sturdy burghers — the merchants, artisans, lawyers of the cities — who, in the eleventh century, showed themselves stronger than *lords*, will in time, with the help of the yeomanry, prove themselves stronger than *kings*. Europe shall be not only orderly, but free. Out of despotic monarchy will rise constitutional, representative government.

I. England

207. General Statement. — In earlier chapters we told of the origin of the English people and traced their growth under Saxon, Danish, and Norman rulers. In the present section we shall tell very briefly the story of their fortunes under the Plantagenet[1] house and its branches, thus carrying on our narrative to the accession of the Tudors in 1485, from which event dates the beginning of the modern history of England.

The chief events of the period which we shall notice were the martyrdom of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, the loss of the English possessions in France, the wresting of *Magna Carta* from King John, the formation of the House of Commons, the conquest of Wales, the wars with Scotland, the Hundred Years' War with France, and the Wars of the Roses.

[1] The name Plantagenet came from the peculiar badge, a sprig of broom plant (*plante de genêt*), adopted by one of the early members of the house. Following is a table of the sovereigns of the family.

Henry II	1154–1189		
Richard I	1189–1199		
John	1199–1216		
Henry III	1216–1272		
Edward I	1272–1307		
Edward II	1307–1327		
Edward III	1327–1377		
Richard II	1377–1399		
		HOUSE OF LANCASTER	
		Henry IV	1399–1413
		Henry V	1413–1422
		Henry VI	1422–1461
		HOUSE OF YORK	
		Edward IV	1461–1483
		Edward V	1483
		Richard III	1483–1485

208. The Martyrdom of Thomas Becket (1172). — The most impressive event in the reign of the first Plantagenet was a tragedy, — the murder of Thomas Becket, the Archbishop of Canterbury. This event possesses great historical interest for the reason that it grew out of those contentions between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities which, as we have seen, make up a large part of mediæval history.

The circumstances leading up to the tragedy were these. In the early years of Henry's reign Thomas had been a favorite courtier, and chancellor of the realm. Thinking that he would serve him well as primate, Henry made him Archbishop of Canterbury. As archbishop, Thomas came into conflict with the king on several matters involving the relations of the clergy to the civil power, the most important of which was a question regarding the trial of clerks by the secular courts. At this time in England the clergy were exempt from the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts of justice.[2] Since the Church courts could inflict no severer penalty than imprisonment, it often happened that clerks guilty of the most heinous crimes, even of murder, were punished inadequately, or even not at all. Moreover, the judges of these courts were said to be over-lenient in dealing with accused members of their own order.

Henry resolved that the clergy, like laymen, should be subject to the civil courts. To this end he caused to be drawn up the so-called Constitutions of Clarendon (1164), a collection of "a certain part of the customs, liberties, and dignities of his ancestors," which among other things provided that persons in orders accused of crime should be tried by the king's judges, if these judges deemed the cases to be such as should come before them, and that no case should be appealed from the courts of the archbishops to the Pope without the king's consent.

[2] Charlemagne had recognized the principle, held from early times by the Church, that ecclesiastics should be amenable only to the ecclesiastical tribunals, by freeing the whole body of the clergy from the jurisdiction of the temporal courts, in criminal as well as in civil cases. Gradually the bishops acquired the right to try all cases relating to marriage, trusts, perjury, simony, or concerning widows, orphans, or crusaders, on the ground that such cases had to do with religion.

PLATE V. — CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL. (From a photograph)

Thomas, after some hesitation, swore to observe the Constitutions, but soon he repented having done so, and sought and obtained from the Pope release from his oath. He maintained that the ordinances took away from the Church undoubted rights and privileges. His course led to a long and violent quarrel with the king. Finally, Henry dropped an impatient expression, which four of his courtier knights interpreted as a wish that Thomas should be put out of the way. These men sought out the archbishop in the cathedral at Canterbury and murdered him on the steps of the altar.

FIG. 37. — THE MURDER OF THOMAS BECKET. (From a Canterbury seal of the fourteenth century)

The people ever regarded Thomas as a martyr and his tomb in the cathedral became a place of pilgrimage. Three hundred years later the poet Chaucer made the journey thither of a goodly company of pilgrims the groundwork of his celebrated *Canterbury Tales* (sec. 228).

The attitude of the people after the murder of Thomas compelled Henry to give up the idea of enforcing the provisions of the Constitutions of Clarendon. Moreover, he was constrained to do penance for his participation in the crime by submitting to a flogging by the monks of Canterbury at the martyr's tomb.

209. Loss of the English Possessions in France (1202–1204). — The issue of the battle of Hastings, in 1066, made William of Normandy king of England. But we must bear in mind that he still held his possessions in France as a fief from the French king, whose vassal he was. These Continental lands, save for some short intervals, remained under the rule of William's Norman successors in England. Then, when Henry, Count of Anjou, came to the English throne as the first of the Plantagenets, these territories were greatly increased by the French possessions of that prince. The larger part of Henry's dominions, indeed, was in France, the

whole of the western half of the country being in his hands; but for all of this he of course paid homage to the French king.

As was inevitable, a feeling of intense jealousy sprang up between the two sovereigns. The French king was ever watching for some pretext upon which he might deprive his rival of his possessions in France. The opportunity came when John, in 1199, succeeded Richard the Lion-hearted as king of England. Twice that odious tyrant was summoned by Philip Augustus of France to appear before his French peers and clear himself of certain charges, one of which was the murder of his nephew Arthur. John refused to obey the summons. Philip was finally able, so strong was the feeling against John, to dispossess him of all his lands in France, save a part of Aquitaine in the south.

The loss of these lands was a great gain to England. The Angevin kings had been pursuing a policy which, had it been successful, would have made England a subordinate part of a great continental state. That danger was now averted. In the words of Freeman, "England had been a dependency of Anjou; Aquitaine was now a dependency of England."

210. **Magna Carta** (1215). — *Magna Carta*, the "Great Charter," held sacred as the safeguard of English liberties, was an instrument which the English barons and clergy wrested from King John, and in which the ancient rights and privileges of the people were clearly defined and guaranteed.

The circumstances which led up to this memorable transaction, narrated in the briefest way possible, were as follows. Among the kings of foreign race whom the Norman Conquest brought into England there were those who disregarded the customs and institutions of the realm and ruled in a very arbitrary and despotic manner. King John, as will easily be believed from the revelation of his character already made, surpassed the worst of his predecessors in tyranny and wickedness. His course led to an open revolt of the barons of the realm. The tyrant was forced to bow to the storm he had raised. He met his barons at Runnymede, a flat meadow on the Thames, near Windsor, and there affixed his seal to the instrument that had been prepared to receive it.

ANGEVIN DOMINIONS
Scale of Miles
0 50 100 150 200
Countries held by Vassals from Henry II
Held by Henry II from a superior king
Held by Henry II in his own right
NORTH SEA
Irish Channel
English Channel
BAY OF BISCAY
THE MAN. WORKS.

Among the important articles of the Great Charter were the following, which we give as showing at once the nature of the venerable document and the kind of grievances of which the people had occasion to complain.

ART. 12. "No scutage[3] or aid shall be imposed in our kingdom except by the common council of our kingdom, except for the ransoming of our body, for the making of our oldest son a knight, and for once marrying our oldest daughter, and for these purposes it shall be only a reasonable aid;[4] . . .

ART. 39. "No free man shall be taken or imprisoned or dispossessed, or outlawed, or banished, or in any way destroyed, nor will we go upon him, nor send upon him, except by the legal judgment of his peers or by the law of the land.

ART. 40. "To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny, or delay right or justice."

The Great Charter did not create new rights and privileges, but in its main points simply reasserted and confirmed old usages and laws. It was immediately violated by John and afterwards was disregarded by many of his successors; but the people always clung to it as the warrant and safeguard of their liberties, and again and again forced tyrannical kings to renew and confirm its provisions, and swear solemnly to observe all its articles.

Considering the far-reaching consequences that resulted from the granting of *Magna Carta*, — the securing of constitutional liberty as an inheritance for the English-speaking race in all parts of the world, — it must always be considered the most important concession that a freedom-loving people ever wrung from a tyrannical sovereign.

211. Beginnings of the House of Commons (1265). — The reign of Henry III (1216–1272), John's son and successor, witnessed the second important step taken in English constitutional freedom. This was the formation of the House of Commons, the

[3] Scutage was a money payment made in commutation of personal military service.

[4] This article respecting taxation was suffered to fall into abeyance in the reign of John's successor, Henry III, and it was not until about one hundred years after the granting of *Magna Carta* that the great principle that the people should be taxed only through their representatives in Parliament became fully established.

Great Council having up to this time been made up of nobles and bishops. It was again the royal misbehavior — so frequently is it, as Lieber says, that Liberty is indebted to bad kings, though to them she owes no thanks — that led to this great change in the form of the English national assembly.

Henry had violated his oath to observe the provisions of the Great Charter and had become even more tyrannical than his father. In the words of a contemporary, the English were oppressed "like as the people of Israel under Pharaoh." The final outcome was an uprising of the barons and the people similar to that in the reign of King John. The leader of the revolt was Earl Simon, a son of the Simon de Montfort who led the first crusade against the Albigenses. It was open war between the king and his people. In a great engagement known as the battle of Lewes (1264), the royal forces were defeated and Henry was taken prisoner.

In order to rally all classes to the support of the cause he represented, Earl Simon now issued, in the king's name, writs of summons to the barons (save the king's adherents), the bishops, and the abbots to meet in Parliament; and at the same time sent similar writs to the sheriffs of the different shires, directing them "to return two knights for the body of their county, with two citizens or burghers for every city and borough contained in it."

Although the knights of the different shires had in several instances before this been represented by delegates, so that the principle of representation was not now for the first time introduced into the English constitution, still this was the first time when plain untitled citizens, or burghers, had been called to take their place with the barons, bishops, and knights, in the great council of the nation, to join in deliberations on the affairs of the realm.[5]

[5] At first the burghers could take part only in questions relating to taxation, but gradually they acquired the right to share in all matters that might come before Parliament. Just thirty years later (in 1295), in the reign of Edward I, there was gathered through regular constitutional summons what came to be called the Model Parliament, since in its composition it served as a pattern for later Parliaments.

From this gathering, then, may be dated the birth of the House of Commons (1265). Formed as it was of knights and burghers, representatives of the common people, it was at first a weak and timorous body, quite overawed by the great lords, but was destined finally to grow into the controlling branch of the British Parliament.

212. **Conquest of Wales** (1272–1282). — For more than seven hundred years after the withdrawal of the Romans from Britain, the Celtic tribes of Wales maintained among their mountain fastnesses an ever-renewed struggle with the successive invaders of the island, — with Saxon, Dane, and Norman. They were

FIG. 38. — CARNARVON CASTLE. (From a photograph)
This fortress was founded by Edward I in 1283. It is one of the most impressive of the decayed mediæval strongholds of the British Isles

forced to acknowledge the overlordship of some of the Saxon and Norman kings; but they were restless vassals, and were constantly withholding tribute and refusing homage.

When Edward I (1272–1307) came to the English throne, Llewellyn III, who held the overlordship of the Welsh chiefs, refused to render homage to the new king. Edward led a strong army into the fastnesses of the country and quickly reduced his rebel vassal to submission. A few years later, and the Welsh patriots were again in arms; but the uprising was soon crushed, and Llewellyn was slain (1282). His head, after the barbarous manner of the times, was exposed over the gateway of the Tower of London. The last remnant of Welsh independence was now extinguished. Edward made his little son, born during the

campaign, feudal lord of the Welsh, with the title of Prince of Wales; and from that time the title has usually been borne by the eldest son of the English sovereign.

The strong-walled and picturesque castle-fortresses — those at Conway and Carnarvon are particularly celebrated — which Edward built or strengthened to guard the conquered land are, like the old watch-towers of the Norman kings in England (sec. 116), historical monuments of the greatest interest to the modern traveler in Wales.

For two centuries after the death of Llewellyn the Welsh were the unwilling and at times rebellious subjects of England. Then occurred a happy circumstance, — the accession to the English throne of a prince of Welsh descent; for Henry Tudor, the first of the Tudor dynasty, was the grandson of a Welsh knight, named Owen Tudor. With princes of the ancient British race reigning in London, the Welsh, from sullen subjects, were suddenly transformed into enthusiastic and loyal supporters of the English throne.

213. **Wars with Scotland** (1296–1328). — From the time of King Alfred's son Edward, the kings of England had intermittently laid claim to the suzerainty of the Scottish realm. The Norman and Plantagenet kings down to the time of Edward I were constantly quarreling with the Scots about this matter of English overlordship and Scotch vassalage. During Edward I's reign an opportunity presented itself for a seemingly final settlement of the question. In 1285 the ancient Celtic line of Scottish chiefs became extinct. A great number of claimants for the vacant throne immediately arose. Chief among these were Robert Bruce and John Balliol, distinguished noblemen of Norman descent, attached to the Scottish court. Edward was asked to act as arbitrator and decide to whom the crown should be given. He consented to do so, but only on condition that the Scottish nobles should do homage to him as their overlord. This they were constrained to do. Edward's commissioners then decided the question of the succession in favor of Balliol, who now took the crown of Scotland as the fully acknowledged vassal of the English sovereign (1292).

Balliol soon broke the feudal ties which bound him to Edward and sought an alliance with the French king. In the war that followed the Scots were defeated and Scotland fell back as a forfeited fief into the hands of Edward (1296). As a sign that the Scottish kingdom had come to an end, Edward carried off to London the royal regalia, and with this a large stone, known as the Stone of Scone, upon which the Scottish kings, from time out of memory, had been accustomed to be crowned. The block was taken to Westminster Abbey, and there put beneath the seat of a stately throne-chair, which to this day is used in the coronation ceremonies of the English sovereigns.



FIG. 39. — CORONATION CHAIR IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY

Beneath the seat is the celebrated Scottish Stone of Scone, which was carried away from Scotland by Edward I

The two countries were not long united. The Scotch people loved too well their ancient liberties to submit quietly to this extinguishment of their national independence. Under the inspiration and lead of the famous Sir William Wallace, an outlaw knight, all the Lowlands were soon in determined revolt. Wallace gained some successes,[6] but at length was betrayed into Edward's hands. He was condemned to death as a traitor, and his head, garlanded with a crown of laurel, was fixed on London Bridge (1305). The romantic life of Wallace, his patriotic services, his heroic exploits, and his tragic death at once lifted him to the place that he has ever since held as the national hero of Scotland.

The struggle in which Wallace had fallen was soon renewed by the almost equally renowned hero Robert Bruce (grandson of the Robert Bruce mentioned above), who was the representative

[6] Notably a great victory at what is known as the battle of Stirling (1297).

of the nobles, as Wallace had been of the common people. With Edward II[7] Bruce fought the great battle of Bannockburn, near Stirling. Edward's army was almost annihilated (1314). It was the most appalling disaster that had befallen the arms of the English people since the memorable defeat of Harold at Hastings.

The independence of Scotland really dates from the great victory of Bannockburn, but the English were too proud to acknowledge it until after fourteen years more of war. Finally, in the year 1328, the young king Edward III gave up all claim to the Scottish crown, and Scotland, with the hero Bruce as its king, took its place as an independent power among the nations of Europe.

Respecting the results to both the English and the Scotch of the failure of the Edwards to subject Scotland to their rule, the historian Gardiner finely comments as follows: "Morally, both nations were in the end the gainers. The hardihood and self-reliance of the Scottish character is distinctly to be traced to those years of struggle against a powerful neighbor. England, too, was the better for being balked of its prey. No nation can suppress the liberty of another without endangering its own."

The independence gained by the Scotch at Bannockburn was maintained for nearly three centuries, — until 1603, — when the crowns of England and Scotland were peacefully united in the person of James VI of Scotland, who became James I of England, the founder of the Stuart dynasty of English kings. During the greater part of these three hundred years the two countries were very quarrelsome neighbors.

The Hundred Years' War (1338–1453)

214. Causes of the War. — The long and wasteful war between England and France known in history as the Hundred Years' War was a most eventful one, and its effect upon both England

[7] Edward I died while on a campaign against the Scots (1307). He was one of the ablest and best beloved of English kings. He so improved the laws of the realm, and made such great and beneficent changes in the administration of justice as to earn the title of the "English Justinian."

and France so important and lasting as to entitle it to a prominent place in the records of the closing events of the Middle Ages. Freeman likens the contest to the Peloponnesian War in ancient Greece; and Hallam says that since the fall of Rome there had been no war among European nations "so memorable as that of Edward III and his successors against France, whether we consider its duration, its objects, or the magnitude and variety of its events."

The war with Scotland was one of the things that led up to this war. All through that struggle France, as the old and jealous rival of England, was ever giving aid and encouragement to the Scots. Then the English possessions in France, for which the English king owed homage to the French sovereign as overlord, were a source of constant dispute between the two countries. Trade jealousies also contributed to the causes of mutual hostility.

Furthermore, upon the death of Charles IV of France, the last of the direct Capetian line, Edward III laid claim to the French crown in much the same way that William of Normandy centuries before had laid claim to the crown of England.

215. **The Battle of Crécy** (1346). — The first great combat of the long war was the famous battle of Crécy. Edward had invaded France with a strong force, made up largely of English bowmen, and had penetrated far into the country, ravaging the land as he went, when he finally halted and faced the pursuing French army near the village of Crécy, where he inflicted upon it a most terrible defeat. Twelve hundred knights, the flower of French chivalry, and thousands of foot soldiers lay dead upon the field.

The great battle of Crécy is memorable for several reasons; but chiefly because feudalism and chivalry there received their deathblow. "The whole social and political fabric of the Middle Ages," writes Green, "rested on a military base, and its base was suddenly withdrawn. The churl had struck down the noble; the bowman proved more than a match, in sheer hard fighting, for the knight. From the day of Crécy feudalism tottered slowly but surely to its grave." The battles of the world

were thereafter to be fought and won, not by mail-clad knights with battle-ax and lance, but by common foot soldiers with bow and gun.

216. The Siege and Capture of Calais (1346–1347). — From the field of Crécy Edward led his army to Calais, which fell into his hands at the end of a year's siege. This was a very important event for the English, as it gave them control of the commerce of the Channel and afforded a convenient landing place for their expeditions of invasion.

217. The Black Death (1347–1349). — At just this time there fell upon Europe the awful pestilence known as the Black Death. The plague was introduced from the East by way of the trade routes of the Mediterranean, and from the southern countries spread in the course of a few years over the entire continent, its virulence without doubt being greatly increased by the unsanitary condition of the crowded towns and the wretched mode of living of the poorer classes.

In many places almost all the people fell victims to the scourge. Some villages were left without an inhabitant. Many monasteries were almost emptied. In the Mediterranean and the Baltic ships were seen drifting about without a soul on board. Crops rotted unharvested in the fields; herds and flocks wandered about unattended. It is estimated that from one third to one half of the population of Europe perished. Hecker, an historian of the pestilence, estimates the total number of victims at twenty-five millions. It was the most awful calamity that ever befell the human race.[8]

218. The Battle of Poitiers (1356). — The terrible scourge caused the contending nations for a time to forget their quarrel. But no sooner had a purer atmosphere breathed upon the continent than their minds were again turned to war, and the old struggle was renewed with fresh eagerness.

[8] Under the terror and excitement of the dreadful visitation, religious penitents, thinking to turn away the wrath of Heaven by unusual penances, went about in procession, lacerating themselves with whips (hence they were called *flagellants*). This religious frenzy had its most remarkable manifestation in Germany.

Edward planned a double invasion of France. He himself led an army through the already wasted provinces of the north, while his eldest son, known from the color of the armor he wore as the Black Prince, ravaged with another the rich lands of the south. As the prince's army, numbering about eight thousand men, loaded with booty, was making its way back to the coast, it found its path, near Poitiers, blocked by a French army of fifty thousand, led by King John, the successor of Philip. A battle ensued which proved for the French a second Crécy. The arrows of the English bowmen drove them in fatal panic from the field, which was strewn with thousands of their dead. King John and his son Philip were taken prisoners.

219. **The Peasants' Revolt** (1381). — During most of the half century succeeding the treaty that soon followed the battle of Poitiers,[9] the war between the two countries was practically suspended. The most important event in English history during this interval was what is known as the Peasants' Revolt.

One of the grievances of the peasants grew out of their relations to the landlords. Many of the former serfs had commuted into money payments the personal services they owed their lords (sec. 95) and had thus got rid of this badge of serfdom. They were now free laborers working for hire. The rise in wages occasioned by the Black Death caused the landlords to regret the bargain they had made with their former serfs, since the commutation money would not now pay for as many days' labor as the serfs were originally bound to render. The landlords endeavored to escape from their bad bargain by means of legislation. They secured the enactment by Parliament of a law known as the Statute of Laborers (1351), which made it a misdemeanor for any unemployed laborer to refuse to work for the wages paid before the plague. Attempts to enforce this statute caused much discontent and trouble.

[9] The Treaty of Bretigny (1360). By the terms of this treaty Edward was to keep possession of the duchy of Aquitaine and some other provinces, not, however, as fiefs from the French king, in which way he had hitherto held his lands in France, but in full sovereignty.

The hard conditions under which those still held in serfdom led their lives constituted another grievance of a large class. In these words of one of the leaders of the uprising we hear the burden of their complaint: "For what reason do they hold us in bondage? Are we not all descended from the same parents Adam and Eve? And what can they show, or what reasons give, why they should be more the masters than ourselves?"

A third grievance of the peasants, and seemingly the immediate cause of the revolt, was the imposition of a heavy poll tax, which struck the poor as well as the rich, to meet the expenses of the French war.

The storm burst in 1381. The peasants rose in almost every part of England and marched in crowds upon London. Their most noted leaders were Wat Tyler, Jack Straw, and John Ball. The essence of their demands was the abolition of villanage (serfdom) in England.

There was tumult and violence everywhere. Abbeys and manor houses were sacked, and the charters which were the evidence of the peasants' servitude were burned. The revolt had the usual issue. The bands of insurgents were finally scattered and their leaders were pitilessly put to death.

Yet the insurrection was a success after all. The fear of another uprising and the inefficient character of sullen labor caused the landlords to hasten the process that had long been going on of commuting into money payments or rents the grudgingly rendered personal services of the serfs. At the end of a hundred years after the revolt there were very few serfs to be found in England.

The abolition of serfdom was an important step in the nationalization of the English people. Sweeping away artificial barriers between classes, it hastened the unification of English society and the creation of a true English nation.

220. **Battle of Agincourt** (1415). — During the reign in England of Henry V, the second sovereign of the House of Lancaster, France was unfortunate in having an insane king, Charles VI; and Henry, taking advantage of the disorder into which the French kingdom naturally fell under these circumstances, invaded the

country with a powerful army. After losing a great part of his followers through sickness, Henry finally, with a force of only about ten thousand men, chiefly archers, met a French feudal army fifty thousand strong on the field of Agincourt. The French suffered a most humiliating defeat, their terrible losses falling, as at Crécy, chiefly upon the knighthood. Five years later was concluded the Treaty of Troyes, according to the terms of which the French crown, upon the death of Charles, was to go to the English king.



FIG. 40. — CHARGE OF FRENCH KNIGHTS AND FLIGHT OF ENGLISH ARROWS

221. Joan of Arc; the Relief of Orleans (1429). — But patriotism was not yet wholly extinct among the French people. There were many who regarded the concessions of the Treaty of Troyes as not only weak and shameful but as unjust to the Dauphin Charles, who was thereby disinherited, and they accordingly refused to be bound by its provisions. Consequently, when the poor insane king died, the terms of the treaty could not be carried out in full, and the war dragged on. The party that stood by their native prince, afterwards crowned as Charles VII, were at last reduced to most desperate straits. The greater part of the country was in the hands of the English, who were holding in close siege the important city of Orleans (1428).

But the darkness was the deep gloom that precedes the dawn. A better day was about to rise over the distressed country. A strange deliverer now appears, — the famous Joan of Arc. This young peasant girl, with soul sensitive to impressions from brooding over her country's wrongs and sufferings, saw visions and heard voices which bade her undertake the work of delivering France. She was obedient unto the heavenly voices.

The warm, impulsive French nation, ever quick in responding to appeals to the imagination, was aroused exactly as it was stirred by the voice of the preachers of the Crusades. Religious enthusiasm now accomplished what patriotism alone could not do.

Rejected by some, yet received by most of her countrymen as a messenger from Heaven, the maiden kindled throughout the land a flame of enthusiasm that nothing could resist. Inspiring the dispirited French soldiers with new courage, she forced the English to raise the siege of Orleans (from which exploit she became known as the Maid of Orleans), and speedily brought about the coronation of Prince Charles at Rheims (1429). Shortly afterward she fell into the hands of the English, was tried by ecclesiastical judges for witchcraft and heresy, and was condemned to be burned as a heretic and a witch. Her martyrdom took place at Rouen in the year 1431.



FIG. 41. — JOAN OF ARC. (From a photograph of a beautiful painting in the Historical Gallery at Versailles)

We have no authentic likeness of Joan of Arc. The above must be regarded as an idealized portrait

But the spirit of the Maid had already taken possession of the French nation. From this on, the war, though long continued, went steadily against the English. Little by little they were pushed off from the soil they had conquered, and driven out of their own Gascon lands of the south as well, until finally they held nothing in the land save Calais. Thus ended, in 1453, the year of the fall of Constantinople, the Hundred Years' War.

222. Effects upon England of the War. — The most important effects of the war as concerns England were the enhancement of

the power of the Lower House of Parliament and the awakening of a national spirit. The maintaining of the long and costly quarrel called for such heavy expenditures of men and money that the English kings were made more dependent than hitherto upon the representatives of the people, who were careful to make their grants of supplies conditional upon the correction of abuses or the confirming of their privileges. Thus the war served to make the Commons a power in the English government.

Again, as the war was participated in by all classes alike, the great victories of Crécy, Poitiers, and Agincourt aroused a national pride, which led to a closer union between the different elements of society. Normans and English, enlisted in a common enterprise, were fused by the ardor of a common patriotic enthusiasm into a single people. The real national life of England dates from this time.

The Wars of the Roses (1455–1485)

223. **Introductory.** — The Wars of the Roses is the name given to a long contest between the adherents of the houses of York and Lancaster, rival branches of the royal family of England. The strife was so named because the Yorkists adopted as their badge a white rose and the Lancastrians a red one.

224. **Chief Battles of the War.** — The three battles which may be made to serve as landmarks of the struggle were the first battle of St. Albans (1455), the battle of Towton Field (1461), and the battle of Bosworth Field (1485). The first marks the commencement of the struggle. The second was the most terrible battle fought in England after that of Hastings. The third battle marks the close of the war. In this fight King Richard III,[10] the last of the House of York, was overthrown and slain by Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, who was crowned on the field with the diadem which had fallen from the head of Richard, and saluted as King Henry VII. With him began the dynasty of the Tudors.

[10] This is the Richard who, in order to make secure his title to the crown, is believed to have caused the murder of the two little princes, his nephews, in the Tower of London (1483).

225. The Effects of the Wars. — The first important result of the Wars of the Roses was the ruin of the baronage of England. One half of the nobility were slain. Those that survived were ruined, their estates having been wasted or confiscated during the progress of the struggle. Not a single great house retained its old-time wealth and influence. The war marks the final downfall of feudalism in England.

The second result of the struggle sprang from the first. This was the great peril into which English liberty was cast by the ruin of the nobility. It was primarily the barons who had forced the Great Charter from King John, and who had kept him and his successors from reigning like absolute monarchs. Now the once proud and powerful barons were ruined, and their confiscated estates had gone to increase the influence and patronage of the sovereign, who when strong and willful, like Henry VIII, did pretty much as he pleased and became unjust and tyrannical. In short, upon the ruins of the baronage was erected something like a royal despotism. Not until the revolution of the seventeenth century did the people, by overturning the throne of the Stuarts, curb the undue power of the crown and recover their lost liberties.

Growth of the English Language and Literature

226. The Language. — From the Norman Conquest to the middle of the fourteenth century there were in use in England three languages: Norman French was the speech of the conquerors and the medium of polite literature; Saxon, or Old English, was the tongue of the conquered people; while Latin was the language of the laws and records, of the Church services, and of the works of the learned.

Modern English is the old Saxon tongue worn and improved by use, and enriched by a large infusion of Norman-French words, with less important additions from the Latin and other languages. It took the place of the Norman-French in the courts of law about the middle of the fourteenth century. At this time

the language was broken up into many dialects, and the expression "King's English" is supposed to have referred to the standard form employed in state documents and in use at court.

227. Effect of the Norman Conquest on English Literature. — The blow that struck down King Harold and his brave thanes on the field of Hastings silenced for the space of above a century the voice of English literature. The tongue of the conquerors became the speech of the court, the nobility, and the clergy; while the language of the despised English was, like themselves, crowded out of every place of honor. But when, after a few generations, the downtrodden race began to reassert itself, English literature emerged from its obscurity, and, with an utterance somewhat changed, — yet unmistakably it is the same voice, — resumed its interrupted lesson and its broken song.

228. Chaucer (1340?–1400). — Holding a position high above all other writers of early English is Geoffrey Chaucer. He is the first in time, and, after Shakespeare, perhaps the first in genius, among the great poets of the English-speaking race. He is reverently called the "Father of English poetry."

Chaucer stands between two ages, the mediæval and the modern. He felt not only the influences of the age of feudalism which was passing away, but also those of the new age of learning and freedom which was dawning. It is because he was so sensitive to these various influences, and reflects his surroundings so faithfully in his writings, that these are so valuable as interpreters of the period in which he lived.

Chaucer's greatest and most important work is his *Canterbury Tales*. The poet represents himself as one of a company of story-telling pilgrims who have set out on a journey to the tomb of Thomas Becket at Canterbury (sec. 208). The persons, thirty-two in number, making up the party, represent almost every calling and position in the middle class of English society. The prologue, containing characterizations of the different members of the company, is the most valuable part of the production. Here as in a gallery we have shown to us faithful portraits of our ancestors of the fourteenth century.

229. William Langland. — The genial Chaucer shows us the pleasant, attractive side of English society and life; William Langland, another writer of the same period, in a poem called the *Vision of Piers the Plowman* (1362), lights up for us the world of the poor and the oppressed.

This poem quivers with sympathy for the hungry, labor-worn peasant, doomed to a life of weary routine and hopelessness, despised by haughty lords and robbed by shameless ecclesiastics. The long wars with France had demoralized the nation; the Black Death had just reaped its awful harvest among the ill-clad, ill-fed, and ill-housed poor. Occasional outbursts of wrath against the favored classes are the mutterings of the storm soon to burst upon

FIG. 42. — PLOWING SCENE. (From a manuscript of the fourteenth century)

the social world in the fury of the Peasants' Revolt, and later upon the religious world in the upheavals of the Reformation.

230. John Wycliffe (1324–1384) and the Lollards. — Foremost among the reformers and religious writers of the period under review was John Wycliffe, called "the Morning Star of the Reformation." This bold reformer attacked first many of the practices and then certain of the doctrines of the Church. He gave the English people the first translation of the entire Bible in the English language. There was no press at this time to multiply editions of the book, but by means of manuscript copies it was widely circulated and read. Its influence was very great, and from its appearance may be dated the beginnings of the Reformation in England.

Wycliffe did not wholly escape persecution in life, and his bones were not permitted to rest in peace. His enemies attributed to his teachings the unrest and the revolt of the peasants,

and this caused him to be looked upon by many as a dangerous agitator. In 1415 the Council of Constance (sec. 259) pronounced his doctrines heretical, and ordered that his body be taken from its tomb and burned. This was done, and the ashes were thrown into a neighboring stream called the Swift. "This brook," in the words of the old ecclesiastical writer, Thomas Fuller, "hath conveyed his ashes into Avon, Avon into Severn, Severn into the Narrow Seas, they into the ocean; and thus the ashes of Wycliffe are the emblem of his doctrine, which now is dispersed all the world over."

The followers of Wycliffe became known as Lollards (babblers), a term applied to them in derision. Their religious opinions were regarded as erroneous or as heretical; and heresy at that time was hated and feared, at least by those in authority. Parliament passed a law (1401) known as the Statute for the Burning of Heretics, which made it the duty of the proper civil officers, in cases of persons convicted of heresy by the ecclesiastical courts, to receive the same and "before the people, in a high place, cause them to be burnt, that such punishment may strike fear to the hearts of others."

Heretics had been burned in England before the passage of this law, but now for the first time did Parliament by special enactment make this form of punishment the penalty for religious dissent. It was the opening of a sad chapter in English history. Under the statute many persons whose only fault was the teaching or the holding of religious opinions different from those of the Church perished at the stake.

231. **Caxton (1412–1491) and the Printing Press.** — The great religious movement referred to in the preceding paragraph, which during the sixteenth century transformed the face of England, was hastened by the introduction of printing into the island by William Caxton towards the close of the fifteenth century. The first work which appeared from his press was entitled the *Game of Chess* (1474). He also printed Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, and almost everything else worth reproducing then existing in English, besides various works from the Latin and the French.

The eagerness with which the books which fell from Caxton's press were seized and read by all classes indicates the increasing activity and thoughtfulness of the public mind. Manifestly a new day — one to be filled with intellectual and moral revolutions — was breaking over the land of Alfred and of Wycliffe.

II. France

232. **Beginnings of the French Kingdom.** — The separate history of France may be regarded as beginning with the partition of Verdun in 843. At that time the Carolingians, of whom we have already learned (Chapter VII), exercised the royal power.

Just at the close of the tenth century, in 987, the Capetian dynasty acceded to the throne. The direct Capetian line ruled until 1328, when the Valois branch of the house came into power and ruled until the accession, in 1589, of Henry IV, the first of the Bourbons.

We shall now direct attention to the important transactions of the period covered by the mediæval Capetian kings. Our special aim will be to give prominence to those matters which concern the gradual consolidation of the French monarchy and the development among the French people of the sentiment of nationality.

France under the Direct Line of the Capetians (987–1328)

233. **General Statement.** — The Capetian dynasty takes its name from Hugh Capet, Duke of Francia, the first of the house. The direct line embraced fourteen kings, whose united reigns spanned a space of three hundred and forty-one years.[11]

[11] Table of the Capetian Kings (direct line)

Hugh Capet	987– 996	Louis VIII (the Lion)	1223–1226
Robert II (the Pious)	996–1031	Louis IX (the Saint)	1226–1270
Henry I	1031–1060	Philip III (the Bold)	1270–1285
Philip I	1060–1108	Philip IV (the Fair)	1285–1314
Louis VI (the Fat)	1108–1137	Louis X (*le Hutin*)	1314–1316
Louis VII (the Young)	1137–1180	Philip V (the Tall)	1316–1322
Philip II (Augustus)	1180–1223	Charles IV (the Fair)	1322–1328

London
R. Thames
Canterbury
Dover
Southampton
Hastings
Boulogne
Calais
Bruges
Antwerp
R. Rhine
KINGDOM OF
FLANDERS
Brussels
BRABANT
ENGLISH CHANNEL
R. Somme
Aumale
Havre
Harfleur
Cherbourg
Caen
Rouen
NORMANDY
KINGDOM OF GERMANY
Metz
Verdun
Toul
CHAMPAGNE
R. Seine
Paris
Brest
BRITTANY
Rennes
MAINE
Le Mans
Troyes
Orleans
Angers
Tours
Blois
DUCHY OF
BURGUNDY
ANJOU
R. Loire
Nantes
TOURAINE
BERRY
COUNTY OF BURGUNDY
R. Saone
POITOU
MARCHE
Limoges
Lyons
R. Garonne
AUVERGNE
DAUPHINE
Bordeaux
AQUITAINE
R. Rhone
KINGDOM OF ARLES
BAY
OF BISCAY
Orange
Avignon
Arles
GASCONY
LANGUEDOC
Toulouse
Marseille
PROVENCE
MEDITERRANEAN
SEA
KINGDOM OF NAVARRE
KINGDOM OF ARAGON
FRANCE
About 1180
0 50 100
Scale of Miles.
Royal Domain
Fiefs held by the English King
Fiefs held by other Vassals
THE M.-N. WORKS, BUFFALO.

The first Capetian king differed from his vassal counts and dukes simply in having a more dignified title; his power was scarcely greater than that of many of the lords who paid him homage as their suzerain. But through forfeiture, conquest, and marriage alliances, one after another of the feudal fiefs was added to the royal domains, until finally the greater part of the kingdom was ruled directly by the crown. Before the close of the Middle Ages France had come to be one of the most compact and powerful kingdoms in Europe. How various circumstances conspired to build up the power of the kings at the expense of that of the great feudal lords and of the Church will appear as we go on.

In this place, however, it should be noted that nothing contributed more to the strength and influence of the monarchy during the period of which we are speaking than the fortunate circumstance that for eleven generations, from the accession of Hugh Capet in 987 to the death of Philip the Fair in 1314, no French king lacked a son to whom to transmit his authority. For over three centuries the title was transmitted directly from father to son. With no disputed successions the monarchy grew steadily in power and prestige.

The most noteworthy events of the earlier Capetian period, regarded from the point of view of the growth of the French kingdom, were the acquisition by the French crown of the greater part of the English possessions in France, the Crusades, the admission of the Third Estate to the National Assembly, and the abolition of the order of the Templars. Of these several matters we will now speak in order.

234. The Acquisition of the English Possessions in France. — In our sketch of the growth of England we spoke of the extensive possessions of the first Angevin kings in France, and told how the larger part of these feudal lands were lost through King John's misconduct and resumed as forfeited fiefs by his suzerain Philip Augustus, king of France (sec. 209). The annexation of these large and flourishing provinces to the crown of France brought a vast accession of power and patronage to the king, who was now easily the superior of any of his great vassals.

235. **The French and the Crusades.** — The age of the Capetians was the age of the Crusades. These romantic expeditions, while stirring all Christendom, appealed especially to the ardent, imaginative genius of the Gallic race. Three Capetian kings, Louis VII, Philip Augustus, and Louis IX, were themselves leaders of crusades. It was the great predominance of French-speaking persons among the first crusaders which led the Eastern peoples to call them all Franks, the term still used throughout the East to designate Europeans, irrespective of their nationality.

But it is only the influence of the Crusades on the French monarchy that we need to notice in this place. They tended very materially to weaken the power and influence of the feudal nobility, and in a corresponding degree to strengthen the authority of the crown and add to its dignity. The way in which they brought about this transfer of power from the aristocracy to the king has been already explained in the chapter on the Crusades (sec. 158).

In that same chapter we also saw how the crusade against the Albigenses resulted in the almost total extirpation of that heretical sect and in the final acquisition by the French crown of large and rich territories formerly held by the counts of Toulouse, the patrons of the heretics.

236. **Admission of the Third Estate to the National Assembly (1302).** — The event of the greatest political significance in the Capetian age was the admission, in the reign of Philip the Fair, of the representatives of the towns to the National Assembly. This transaction is in French history what the creation of the House of Commons is in English history (sec. 211). The popular branches of the two councils were, however, called to take part in the administration of public affairs under very different circumstances. In England it was the nobility that sought the people's aid in their struggle with a despotic king. In France it was the king who summoned the burghers to assist him in his quarrel with the papal see. But the fact that the aid of the commons was courted, whether by nobles or by king, indicates that in both countries the middle class was rising into political importance, and was holding in its hands the balance of power.

The dispute between Philip and the Pope to which we have just referred, arose, it will be recalled, respecting the control of the offices and revenues of the Church in France (sec. 168). In order to rally to his support all classes throughout his kingdom, Philip called a meeting of the National Assembly, to which he invited representatives of the burghers, or inhabitants of the towns (1302). This council had hitherto been made up of two estates only, — the nobles and the clergy; now is added what comes to be known as the *Tiers État*, or Third Estate, while the assembly henceforth is called the Estates- or States-General. Before the growing power of this Third Estate — a power developed however outside and not within the National Assembly itself — we shall see the Church, the nobility, and the monarchy all go down, just as in England we shall see clergy, nobles, and king yield to the rising power of the English Commons.

237. **The Abolition of the Order of the Templars** (1307). — The abolition of the order of the Knights of the Temple by Philip the Fair affords in some measure a parallel to the suppression of the English monasteries by Henry VIII in the sixteenth century.

We have already, in connection with the history of the Crusades, learned about the origin of the Templars (sec. 143). In recognition of their services, they had had bestowed upon them, through the gifts of the pious and the grants of princes, enormous riches and the most unusual privileges. The number of manors and castles that they held in the different countries of Europe, but chiefly in France, is estimated at from nine to ten thousand. But gain in wealth and power had been accompanied apparently by a loss in virtue and piety. At all events the most incredible rumors of the immoral and blasphemous character of the secret rites and ceremonies of the society were spread abroad. Its crimes were declared "sufficient to move the earth and disturb the elements."

Taking advantage of the feeling against the order, Philip resolved upon its destruction. He was moved doubtless by various motives, but beyond all question it was the riches of the society, — which Philip coveted, — and not its sins, that were the real cause of its undoing.

The blow fell suddenly. Upon a preconcerted day (Oct. 13, 1307) the chiefs of the order throughout the kingdom were arrested, and many of them afterwards put to death on various charges.[12] The great crime brought to Philip enormous wealth, which greatly enhanced the growing power and patronage of the crown, just as the strength and influence of Henry VIII of England were vastly increased by the confiscated wealth of the religious houses he suppressed.

France under the Mediæval Valois[13] (*1328–1498*)

238. Effects upon France of the Hundred Years' War. — The main interest of the period of French history upon which we here enter attaches to that long struggle between England and France known as the Hundred Years' War. Having already, in connection with English affairs, touched upon the causes and incidents of this war, we shall here speak only of the effects of the struggle on the French people and kingdom. Among these must be noticed the almost complete prostration, by the successive shocks of Crécy, Poitiers, and Agincourt, of the French feudal aristocracy, which was already tottering to its fall through various undermining influences; the growth of the power of the king, a consequence, largely, of the ruin of the nobility; and, lastly, the awakening of a feeling of nationality and the drawing together of the hitherto isolated sections of the country by the attraction of a common and patriotic enthusiasm. Speaking broadly, we may say that by the close of the war feudalism in France was over, and that France had become, partly in spite of the war but more largely by reason of it, not only a great monarchy but a great nation.

[12] The order was formally abolished in 1312 by Pope Clement V, the first of the Avignon popes, who was wholly under the influence of Philip.

[13] The House of Valois, as already pointed out, was a branch of the Capetian family. The following table exhibits the names of the mediæval Valois kings.

Philip VI	1328–1350	Charles VII (the Victorious)	1422–1461
John (the Good)	1350–1364	Louis XI	1461–1483
Charles V (the Wise)	1364–1380	Charles VIII (the Affable)	1483–1498
Charles VI (the Well-Beloved)	1380–1422		

239. Louis XI and Charles the Bold of Burgundy. — The foundations of the French monarchy, laid and cemented in the way we have seen, were greatly enlarged and strengthened by the unscrupulous measures of Louis XI (1461–1483), who was a perfect Ulysses in cunning and deceit. His maxim was, "He who does not know how to dissimulate does not know how to reign." The great feudal lords that still retained power and influence he brought to destruction one after another, and united their fiefs to the royal domains.

Of all the vassal nobles ruined by the craft of Louis, the most renowned and powerful was Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy. Charles was endeavoring, out of a great patchwork of petty feudal states and semi-independent cantons and cities, to build up a kingdom between Germany and France. His success in this effort would have meant practically a restoration of the old Lotharingian kingdom (see map, p. 68), which, it will be recalled, stretched across Europe from the Mediterranean to the North Sea. It seems one of the misfortunes of history that Charles did not succeed in his ambition. Such a kingdom as he planned might have proved a serviceable "buffer state" between France and Germany.

For some of his lands Charles paid homage, or at least owed homage, to the king of France; others he held as fiefs of the Holy Roman Empire. It is easy to understand how these relations of Charles and his known ambitions should have set him apart as one whom his wily neighbor Louis would watch closely. Louis was frequently warring with the duke and forever intriguing against him. Upon the death of the duke — he was killed in 1477 in a battle with the Swiss — Louis, without clear right, seized a considerable part of his dominions.

By cession and by inheritance Louis also added to France important lands in the south (Provence, Roussillon, and Cerdagne), which gave the French kingdom a wider frontage upon the Mediterranean, and made the Pyrenees its southern defense.

240. Invasion of Italy by Charles VIII. — Charles VIII (1483–1498), son and successor of Louis XI, was the last of the mediæval Valois. Through his marriage to Anne of Brittany he brought

that great fief, which had hitherto constituted an almost independent state, under the direct rule of the crown.

Thus through the favor of a long series of circumstances, the persistent policy of his predecessors, and his own politic marriage Charles found himself at the head of a kingdom which, gradually transformed from a feudal league into a true monarchy, had, by slow expansion, touched upon almost every side those limits which were to constitute substantially the boundaries of modern France.

Charles was a romantic youth. His extravagant fancy led him to dream of some brilliant enterprise which should draw the gaze of the world, and which might contribute to the realization of his great project of making France instead of Germany the head of the world-empire. With a standing army, created by Charles VII during the latter years of the war with England,[14] at his command, he invaded Italy, intent on the conquest of Naples, — to which he laid claim on the strength of an old bequest, — proposing, with that state subdued, to lead a crusade to the East against the Turks.

Charles' march through Italy was a mere "promenade." In the early spring of the year 1495 he entered Naples in triumph. Here, in the midst of splendid ceremonies, he caused himself to be crowned "King of Naples, Sicily, and Jerusalem."

Meanwhile the king of Aragon, the Venetians, and other powers were uniting their armies to punish the insolence and check the vaulting ambition of the would-be emperor and crusader. Only at the cost of a large part of his army did Charles succeed in making good his retreat into France. The forces he had left at Naples were quickly driven out of the place, and thus ended the youth's dream of a French world-empire.

This enterprise of Charles is noteworthy not only because it marks the commencement of a long series of brilliant yet disastrous campaigns carried on by the French in Italy, but further on account of Charles' army having been made up largely of

[14] The paid force of infantry and cavalry created by Charles VII in 1448 was the first standing army in Europe, and the beginning of that vast military system which now burdens the great nations of that continent with the support of several millions of soldiers constantly under arms.

paid troops instead of feudal retainers, which fact assures us that the feudal system, as a military organization, had practically come to an end.

Formation of the French Language and the Beginnings of French Literature

241. **The Language.** — The contact of the old Latin speech in Gaul with that of the Teutonic invaders gave rise there to two very distinct dialects. These were the *Langue d'Oc*, or Provençal, the tongue of the South of France and of the adjoining regions of Spain and Italy; and the *Langue d'Oïl*, or French proper, the language of the North.[15]

The soft, musical tongue of the South, predestined though it was to an early decay, was the first, as we shall learn in a moment, to develop a literature; but when the North precipitated itself upon the South in the furious crusades against the Albigenses, the language, literature, and heretical religion of these southern provinces were all swept away together. As the persecuted faith was driven into obscurity, so in like manner the old speech was driven out of palace and court, and found a place only among the rude peasantry.

The position of this once widely used Provençal speech among living languages may be illustrated by comparing its fortunes with those of the Celtic tongue in its conflict with the Anglo-Saxon in the British Isles.

242. **The Troubadours.** — About the beginning of the twelfth century, by which time the Provençal tongue had become settled and somewhat polished, literature in France first began to find a voice in the songs of the Troubadours, the poets of the South. It is instructive to note that it was the home of the Albigensian heresy, the land that had felt the influence of every Mediterranean civilization, that was also the home of the Troubadour literature. The counts of Toulouse, the protectors of the heretics,

[15] The terms *Langue d'Oc* and *Langue d'Oïl* arose from the use of different words for "yes," which in the tongue of the South was *oc*, and in that of the North *oïl*.

were also the patrons of the poets. It was, as we have intimated, the same fierce persecution which uprooted the heretical faith that stilled the song of the Troubadours.

The compositions of the Troubadours were, for the most part, love songs and satires. Among the countless minstrels of the South were some who acquired a fame which was spread throughout Christendom. The verses of the Troubadours were sung in every land, and to their stimulating influence the early poetry of almost every people of Europe is largely indebted.

FIG. 43. — IN THE LAND OF THE TROUBADOURS — THE CASTLE OF FOIX. (From Smith, *The Troubadours at Home*)

243. **The Trouveurs.** — These were the poets of Northern France, who composed in the *Langue d' Oïl*, or Old French tongue. They flourished during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. As the poetical literature of the South found worthy patrons in the counts of Toulouse, so did that of the North find admiring encouragers in the dukes of Normandy.

There was, however, a wide difference between the literature of Southern and that of Northern France. The compositions of the Troubadours were almost exclusively lyric songs, while those of the Trouveurs were chiefly epic or narrative poems, called *romances*. These latter celebrated the chivalrous exploits and loves of great princes and knights, and displayed at times almost Homeric animation and grandeur. Many of them gather about three familiar names, — Charlemagne, King Arthur, and Alexander the Great, — thus forming what are designated as the cycle

of Charlemagne, the Arthurian or Armorican cycle, and the Alexandrian.[16]

The influence of these French romances upon the springing literatures of Europe was most inspiring and helpful. Nor has their influence yet ceased. Thus in English literature, not only did Chaucer and Spenser and all the early island poets draw inspiration from these fountains of Continental song, but the later Tennyson, in his *Idylls of the King*, has illustrated the power over the imagination yet possessed by the Arthurian poems of the old Trouveurs.

244. **Froissart's Chronicles.** — The first really noted prose writer in French literature was Froissart (about 1337–1410), whose picturesqueness of style and skill as a story-teller have won for him the title of the "French Herodotus." Born, as he was, only a little after the opening of the Hundred Years' War, and knowing personally many of the actors in that long struggle, it was fitting that he should have become, as he did, the annalist of those stirring times.

Froissart's inimitable *Chronicles* have an added value from the age in which they were written. It was, as we have learned, a transition period. Feudalism was fast passing away and chivalry was beginning to feel the dissolving breath of a new era. But as the forests never clothe themselves in more gorgeous colors than when already touched by decay, so chivalry never arrayed itself in more splendid magnificence than when about to die. In the age of Edward III and the Black Prince it displayed its most sumptuous and prodigal splendor. And this is the age which the rare genius of Froissart has painted for us.

III. Spain

245. **The Beginnings of Spain.** — When, in the eighth century, the Saracens swept like a wave over Spain, the mountains of Asturias and Cantabria in the northwest corner of the peninsula

[16] These epics, it will be noticed, represent the three elements in the civilization of Western Europe, — the German, the Celtic, and the Græco-Roman. It was the Crusades that brought in a fresh relay of tales and legends from the lands of the East (sec. 159).

afforded a refuge for the most resolute of the Christian chiefs who refused to submit their necks to the Moslem yoke. These brave and hardy warriors not only successfully defended the hilly districts that formed their asylum, but gradually pushed back the invaders and regained control of a portion of the fields and cities that had been lost.

By the opening of the eleventh century several little Christian states, among which we must notice especially the states of Castile and Aragon because of the prominent part they were to play in later history, had been established upon the ground thus recovered or always maintained. Castile was at first simply "a line of castles" against the Moors, whence its name.

246. **Union of Castile and Aragon** (1479). — For several centuries the princes of the little states to which we have referred kept up an incessant warfare with their Mohammedan neighbors; but, owing to dissensions among themselves, they were unable to combine in any effective way for the complete reconquest of their ancient possessions. But the marriage, in 1469, of Ferdinand, prince of Aragon, to Isabella, princess of Castile, paved the way for the virtual union in 1479 of these two leading states, both greatly enlarged since the eleventh century, into a single kingdom. By this happy union the quarrels of these two rival principalities were composed, and they were now free to employ their united strength in effecting what the Christian princes amidst all their contentions had never lost sight of, —the expulsion of the Moors from the peninsula.

247. **The Conquest of Granada** (1492). — At the time when the basis of the Spanish monarchy was laid by the union of Castile and Aragon, the Mohammedan possessions had been reduced, by the constant pressure of the Christian chiefs through eight centuries, to a very limited dominion in the south of Spain. Here the Moors had established a strong, well-compacted state, known as the Kingdom of Granada. As soon as Ferdinand and Isabella had settled the affairs of their dominions, they began to make preparation for the reduction of this last stronghold of the Moorish power in the peninsula.

THE ALHAMBRA: PALACE OF THE MOORISH KINGS AT GRANADA
(From a photograph)

The Moors made a desperate defense of their little state. The struggle lasted for ten years. City after city fell into the hands of the Christian knights, and finally Granada, pressed by an army of seventy thousand, was forced to surrender, and the Cross replaced the Crescent on its walls and towers (1492). The Moors, or Moriscos, as they were called, were allowed to remain in the country, though under many annoying restrictions. What is known as their *expulsion* occurred at a later date (sec. 357).

The fall of Granada holds an important place among the many significant events that mark the latter half of the fifteenth century. It marked the end, after an existence of almost eight hundred years, of Mohammedan rule in the Spanish peninsula, and thus formed an offset to the progress of the Moslem power in Eastern Europe and the loss to the Christian world of Constantinople. It advanced Spain to a place among the foremost nations of Europe, and gave her arms a prestige that secured for her position, influence, and deference long after the decline of her power had commenced.

248. **Influence upon the Spanish Character of the Moorish Domination and the Moorish Wars.** — The long wars which the Spanish Christians waged against the Arab Moors left a deep impress upon the national character. In the first place, the opportunity which they afforded for knightly service and romantic adventure heightened that chivalrous spirit of which more than traces are noticeable in the feelings and the bearing of the Spaniard of to-day.

In the second place, they made religion a thing of patriotism, and thus aroused religious zeal and fostered the growth of intolerance. The unfortunate bias and temper thus imparted to the Spanish national character set Spain apart from the other Western nations, and affords the key to much of her later history both in Europe and in the New World. For illustration, it was, without doubt, the development in the Spanish people of this zealous, uncompromising religious spirit that helped to prepare the ground in Spain for the setting up there of the terrible tribunal of the Inquisition.

249. The Inquisition. — The Inquisition, or Holy Office, was a tribunal the purpose of which was the detection and punishment of heresy. Its establishment in Spain casts a dark shadow upon the reign of the illustrious sovereigns Ferdinand and Isabella.

Being employed by the government for the securing of political as well as religious ends, the tribunal became an instrument of the most incredible tyranny. The Jews were in this earlier period the chief victims of the court. Accompanying the announcement of the sentences of the Holy Office there were solemn public ceremonies known as the *auto de fe* ("act of faith"). The assembly was held in some church or in the public square, and the following day those condemned to death were burned outside the city walls. It is particularly to this last act of the drama that the term *auto de fe* has come popularly to be applied.

The Inquisition secured for Spain unity of religious belief, but only through suppressing freedom of thought, and thereby sapping the strength and virility of the Spanish people. Whatever was most promising and vigorous was withered and blasted, or was cast out. In the year 1492 the Jews were expelled from the country. It is estimated that between two and three hundred thousand of this race were forced to seek an asylum in other lands.

Thus at the same time that Ferdinand and Isabella were doing so much to foster the national life, their unfortunate religious zeal was planting the upas tree which was destined completely to overshadow and poison the springing energies of the nation.

250. Death of Ferdinand and Isabella. — Queen Isabella died in 1504, and Ferdinand followed her in the year 1516, upon which latter event the crown of Spain descended to their grandson, Charles, of whom we shall hear much hereafter as the Emperor Charles V. With his reign the modern history of Spain begins.

FIG. 44. — RECUMBENT EFFIGY OF QUEEN ISABELLA. (From the magnificent sarcophagus in the Royal Chapel at Granada)

Beginnings of the Spanish Language and Literature

251. The Language. — After the union of Castile and Aragon it was the language of the former that became the speech of the Spanish court. During the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella it gradually gained ascendancy over the numerous dialects of the country and became at last the national speech, just as in France the *Langue d'Oïl* finally crowded out all other dialects. By the conquests and colonizations of the sixteenth century this Castilian speech was destined to become only less widely spread than is the English tongue.

252. The Poem of the *Cid*. — Castilian or Spanish literature begins in the twelfth century with the romance poem of the *Cid*, one of the best known literary productions of the mediæval period. This grand national poem was the outgrowth of the sentiments inspired by the long struggle between the Spanish Christians and the Mohammedan Moors. The hero of the epic is Ruy Diaz, surnamed the Cid (meaning probably "lord"), the champion of Christianity and Castilian royalty, during the latter part of the eleventh century, against the Saracens. He is made by the romancers to be the impersonation of every knightly virtue, — generosity, patriotism, courage, truthfulness, honor, and loyalty. The real Cid was quite a different character.

The influence of the romance of the *Cid* in exciting the sentiment of Spanish patriotism and in stimulating the spirit of Spanish nationality has been likened to the effects of the poems of Homer in creating fraternal bonds between the cities of ancient Hellas.

IV. Germany

253. Beginnings of the Kingdom of Germany. — The history of Germany as a separate kingdom begins with the break-up of the empire of Charlemagne, about the middle of the ninth century (sec. 79). The part to the east of the Rhine, with which fragment alone we are now specially concerned, was called the Kingdom of the Eastern Franks, in distinction from that to the

west of the river, which was known as the Kingdom of the Western Franks.

This Eastern Frankish kingdom was made up of several groups of tribes, — the Saxons, the Suabians, the Thuringians, the Bavarians, and the East Franks, of which the latter were at this time chief, and gave name to the whole. Closely allied in race, speech, manners, and social arrangements, all these peoples seemed ready to be welded into a close and firm nation. That such was not the outcome of the historical development during mediæval times was due largely to the adoption by the German emperors of an unfortunate policy respecting a world-empire. This matter will be explained in the following paragraphs.

254. Revival of the Empire by Otto the Great (962); Consequences to Germany of its Renewal. — We have in another place, while tracing the history of the Empire, told how Otto I of Germany, in imitation of Charlemagne, restored the imperial authority (sec. 80). Otto's scheme respecting the establishment of a world-empire was a grand one, but, as had been demonstrated by the failure of the attempt of the great Charles, was an utterly impracticable ideal. Yet the pursuit of this phantom by the German kings resulted in the most woeful consequences to Germany. Trying to grasp too much, the German rulers seized nothing at all. Attempting to be emperors of the world, they failed to become even kings of Germany. While they were engaged in outside enterprises their home affairs were neglected and the vassal princes of Germany succeeded in increasing their power and making themselves practically independent.

Thus while the kings of England, France, and Spain were gradually consolidating their dominions and building up strong centralized monarchies on the ruins of feudalism, the preoccupied sovereigns of Germany were allowing the country to become split up into a great number of semi-independent states, the ambitions and jealousies of whose rulers were to postpone the unification of Germany for several hundred years — until our own day.

Had the emperors inflicted loss and disaster upon Germany alone through this misdirection of their energies, the case would

not be so lamentable; but the fair fields of Italy were for centuries made the camping fields of the imperial armies, and the whole peninsula was kept embroiled with the quarrels of Guelphs and Ghibellines, and thus the nationalization of the Italian people was also delayed for centuries.

Germany received just one positive compensation for all this loss accruing from the ambition of her kings. This was the gift of Italian civilization, which came into Germany through the connections of the emperors with the peninsula.

255. **Germany under the Hohenstaufen Emperors** (1138–1254). — The matter of chief importance during the rule of the Hohenstaufen or Suabian house was, as we have learned, the long and bitter conflict waged between the emperors of this family and the popes.

The name of the most noted of the Hohenstaufen emperors — Frederick Barbarossa — is familiar to us. Frederick gave Germany a good and strong government, and gained a sure place in the affections of the German people, who came to regard him as the representative of the sentiment of German nationality. Other emperors, when engaged in contentions with the Pope, always had a great many among their own German subjects ready to join the Roman see against their own sovereign; but all classes in Germany rallied about their beloved Frederick. When news of his death was brought back from the East (sec. 146) they refused to believe that their "knightly Emperor" was dead, and, as time passed, a legend arose which told how he slept in a cavern beneath one of his castles on a mountain top, and how, when the ravens should cease to circle about the hill, he would appear, to make the German people a nation united and strong.

Frederick Barbarossa was followed by his son Henry VI (1190–1197), who, by marriage, had acquired a claim to the kingdom of Sicily.[17] Almost all his time and resources were spent in

[17] See sec. 112. The Hohenstaufen held the kingdom until 1265, when the Pope gave it as a fief to Charles I of Anjou (brother of Louis IX of France). Charles' oppressive rule led to a revolt of his island subjects, and to the great massacre known as the Sicilian Vespers (1282), one of the great tragedies of history. All the hated race of Frenchmen were either killed or driven out of the island.

attempts to reduce that remote realm to a state of proper subjection to his authority. By leading the emperors to neglect their German subjects and interests, this southern kingdom proved a fatal dower to the Suabian house.

By the close of the Hohenstaufen period Germany was divided into about three hundred virtually independent states, the princes and the cities having taken advantage of the prolonged absences of the emperors, or their troubles with the popes and the Italian cities, to free themselves almost completely from the control of the crown. There was really no longer either a German Kingdom or a Holy Roman Empire. The royal as well as the imperial title had become an empty name.

256. The Seven Electors; the Interregnum (1254–1273). — In order to make intelligible the transactions of that period in German history known as the Interregnum, which we have now reached, we must here say a word about the Electors of the Empire.



FIG. 45. — THE ELECTORS' SEAT. (From a photograph)

This structure stands on the banks of the Rhine near Coblenz. On the top are stone seats where the Electors met to elect the German king. The building shown is an eighteenth-century restoration

When, in the beginning of the tenth century, the German Carolingian line became extinct, the great nobles of the kingdom assumed the right of choosing the successor of the last of the house, and Germany thus became an elective feudal monarchy. In the course of time a few of the leading nobles usurped

the right of choosing the king, and these princes became known as Electors. There were at the end of the Hohenstaufen period seven princes who enjoyed this important privilege, four of whom were secular princes and three spiritual. This electoral body really held the destinies of Germany in its hands.[18]

We are now in a position to understand the shameful transaction of the sale of the German crown. The Electors, like the pretorians of ancient Rome, put up the bauble for sale. There were two bidders, both foreigners, Richard of Cornwall, brother of the English king, Henry III, and Alphonso, king of Castile. Both candidates offered the Electors large bribes, and so both were elected, — one of the Electors voting for both candidates. Although Alphonso had manifested so much anxiety to secure the honor, he never once set foot within the limits of Germany, and Richard contented himself with an occasional visit to the country.

Of course neither of the emperors-elect possessed any real authority in Germany or in any of the countries claimed as parts of the Empire. The period is known in German history as the Interregnum. Anarchy prevailed throughout the country. Princes made themselves petty despots in their dominions, while the lesser nobles became robbers and preyed upon traders.

257. Towns and Free Imperial Cities. — The kingly power having fallen into such utter contempt that all general government was practically in abeyance, the towns found it necessary, in order to protect themselves against the violence and oppression of the princes and barons, to form confederations and take their defense in their own hands. It was during this anarchical period that the Hanseatic League (sec. 185) grew rapidly in strength and influence.

[18] The claims of the Electors were very naturally disputed by some of the other members of the Germanic body. In order to settle the matter forever, the Luxemburg Emperor Charles IV (1347–1378), having first secured the action of a Diet, promulgated a decree called, from its golden seal, the Golden Bull, which confirmed the right of election in the princes who then exercised it, and defined clearly the powers and privileges of the electoral college. This bull remained the fundamental law of the German constitution so long as the Empire lasted, — until 1806.

During the course of the thirteenth century many of the towns, through the favor of their suzerain, were relieved of the presence of the imperial officers and became what are known as *free imperial cities*. They of course still acknowledged the suzerainty of the Emperor, but were allowed to manage their local affairs to suit themselves, and thus became practically little commonwealths, somewhat like the city-republics of Italy.

A century or two after these cities had secured freedom from the imperial superintendence they acquired the right of representation in the Diet, or national legislative body. This was the natural consequence of their growing power, just as in England the increasing weight of the towns led, in the thirteenth century, to the admission of their representatives to Parliament.

258. Rise of the Swiss Republic. — The most noteworthy matters in German history during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are the struggle between the Swiss and the princes of the Hapsburg or Austrian family, the religious movement of the Hussites, and the growing power of the House of Hapsburg.

Embraced within the limits of the mediæval Empire was the country now known as Switzerland. Its liberty-loving people yielded to the Emperor a nominal obedience, like that of the free imperial cities; but they were very impatient of the claims of various feudal lords to political rights and authority over them.

Among the lords claiming or actually possessing rights over different cantons or communities were the counts of Hapsburg.[19] The efforts of the Hapsburgs to bring the mountaineers wholly under their direct power led the three so-called Forest Cantons, Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden, to form a defensive union, known as the Everlasting Compact (1291). This league laid the basis of the Swiss Confederation, one of the most typical and interesting of the federal states of to-day.

[19] So called from the castle of Hapsburg, in Switzerland, the cradle of the house. In 1273 Count Rudolph of Hapsburg was chosen Emperor. A little later he acquired Austria as an appanage for his house. From this new possession the family took a new title, — that of the House of Austria.

The struggle between the brave hillsmen and the House of Hapsburg was long and memorable.[20] Embellished by Swiss patriotism with thrilling tales of heroic daring and self-devotion, the history of this contest reads like an Iliad. But modern historical criticism has reduced much of the story to prose. Thus the tale of the hero-patriot William Tell and of the tyrant Gessler we now know to be a myth, with nothing but the revolt as the nucleus of fact.

Just at the close of the Middle Ages (in 1499) the Hapsburg Emperor Maximilian I, having been defeated in a war with the league, concluded with it a treaty which practically established the independence of the Swiss Confederation, and gave it a place in the family of European states.

One effect upon the Swiss of their long struggle for liberty was the fostering among them of such a love for the military life that when, at a later period, there was lack of warlike occupation for them at home, the Swiss soldiers hired themselves out to the different sovereigns of Europe ; and thus it happened that, though trained in the school of freedom, these sturdy mountaineers became the most noted mercenary supporters of despotism.

259. The Hussites. — About the beginning of the fifteenth century, through the medium of the university connections between England and Germany, the doctrines of the English reformer Wycliffe began to spread in Bohemia. The chief of the new sect was John Huss, a professor of the University of Prague. The doctrines of the reformer were condemned by the great Council of Constance, and Huss himself, having been delivered over into the hands of the civil authorities for punishment, was burned at the stake (1415). The following year Jerome of Prague, another reformer, was likewise burned.

Shortly after the burning of Huss a crusade was proclaimed against his followers, who had risen in arms. Then began a cruel,

[20] Noteworthy battles, all victories for the Swiss, were the battle of Morgarten (1315), the battle of Sempach (1386), and the battle of Näfels (1388). It was at Sempach, as a patriotic myth relates, that Arnold of Winkelried broke the ranks of the Austrians by collecting in his arms as many of their lances as he could, and, as they pierced his breast, bearing them with him to the ground, exclaiming, " Comrades, I will open a road for you."

desolating war of fifteen years, the outcome of which was the almost total extermination of the radical party among the Hussites.

260. The Imperial Crown becomes Hereditary in the House of Austria (1438). — In the year 1438 Albert, Duke of Austria, was raised by the Electors to the imperial throne. His accession marks an epoch in German history, for, from this time on until the dissolution of the Empire by Napoleon in 1806, the imperial crown was practically hereditary in the Hapsburg family, the Electors, although never failing to go through the formality of an election, always choosing a person of Hapsburg descent.[21]

261. The Reign of Maximilian I. — The greatest of the Hapsburg line during the mediæval period was Maximilian I (1493–1519). The most noteworthy matter of his reign was the efforts made for constitutional reforms which should enable Germany to secure that internal peace and national unity which France, England, and Spain had each already in a fair degree attained.

The condition of Germany at this time was somewhat similar to that of our Union under the Articles of Confederation. The need of a firmer union was recognized. One way of reaching this end was to invest the Emperor with greater authority; but the Electors and princes would not give up any part of their privileges and power. "To expect help from the princes," said despairingly a friend of the Emperor, "is like looking for grapes from thistles."

Working under such untoward circumstances Maximilian, although he had large and ambitious plans for the Empire, accomplished but little. On several sides the Empire was shorn of territory; within, brigandage was rife. The Emperor's pathetic words, "Earth possesses no joy for me; alas, poor land of Germany!" vividly reveal to us the hopeless condition of the "Fatherland" as the Middle Ages were closing.

[21] There was one exception; Francis I (of Lorraine), 1747–1765, was chosen as the husband of the Hapsburg queen, Maria Theresa.

Beginnings of German Literature

262. **The Nibelungenlied.** — It was during the rule of the Hohenstaufen that Germany produced the first pieces of a national literature. The *Nibelungenlied*, or the "Lay of the Nibelungs," is the great German mediæval epic. It was reduced to writing about 1200, being a recast, by some Homeric genius perhaps, of ancient German legends and lays dating from the sixth and seventh centuries. The hero of the story is Siegfried, the Achilles of Teutonic legend and song. The names and deeds of Attila, Theodoric, and other warriors of the age of the Wanderings of the Nations are mingled in its lines.

This great national epic romance may be likened to the poem *Beowulf* of our Saxon ancestors (sec. 22). It is gross and brutal, filled with fierce fightings and horrible slaughters, — a reflection of the rude times that gave birth to the original ballads out of which the epic was woven; but there are also embodied in it the feudal virtues of loyalty and courage, while it further bears traces of the later softening influences of Christianity and of chivalry.

263. **The Minnesingers.** — Under the same emperors, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Minnesingers, the poets of love, as the word signifies, flourished. They were the "Troubadours of Germany." The most eminent of the Minnesingers was Walther von der Vogelweide (1170–1227), to whom we are indebted for the epigram, "Woman is women's fairest name, and honors them more than Lady." Many of the love songs of these minstrels were refined and chivalrous and pure, and thus tended to soften the manners and lift the hearts of the German people.

Closely connected with the lyric poetry of the Minnesingers is a species of chivalric romances known as court epics. The finest of these pieces have for their groundwork the mythic Celtic-French legends of the Holy Grail and of the Knights of King Arthur's Round Table. The best representative of these romances is the poem of *Parsifal*.[22] The moral and spiritual

[22] By Wolfram of Eschenbach (d. about 1220).

teaching of the poem is that only through humility, purity, and human sympathy can the soul attain unto the highest perfection of which it is capable.

Just at the close of the Middle Ages the humanistic studies (sec. 280) came to interest the scholars of Germany. The result was that for three hundred years thereafter much of the best literary work of the German scholars and writers was done in Latin, — the mother tongue being regarded by the younger or later humanists as plebeian and fit only for inferior composition, — and thus the development of the native literature was seriously checked.

V. Russia

264. The Beginnings of Russia. — We have already seen how, about the middle of the ninth century, the Swedish adventurer Rurik became the chief of some Slavonic and Finnish tribes dwelling on the shores of the Gulf of Finland, in the neighborhood of Novgorod, and there laid the foundation of what was destined to grow into one of the leading powers of Europe (sec. 84). The state came to be known as Russia, from *Ros*, the name of the Scandinavian settlers. The descendants of Rurik gradually extended their authority over adjoining tribes, until nearly all the northwestern Slavs were included in their growing dominions.

265. The Mongol Invasion. — Before the end of the eleventh century the unity of the Russian state had been almost completely destroyed. The monarchy became a loose confederacy of petty, jealous, and warring principalities. This state of things prepared the way for the overwhelming calamity which befell Russia in the thirteenth century.

The misfortune to which we refer was the overrunning and conquest of the country by the Tartar hordes of Jenghiz Khan and his successors (sec. 174). The barbarian conquerors inflicted the most horrible atrocities upon the unfortunate land, and for two hundred and fifty years held the Russian princes in a degrading bondage, forcing them to pay homage and tribute. This period is almost a perfect blank in Russian history. The misfortune delayed

for centuries the nationalization of the Slavonian peoples. It was just such a misfortune as a little later befell the Greeks and the other races of Southeastern Europe.

266. The Rise of Muscovy; Russia freed from the Mongols. — During this period of Tartar domination the state of Muscovy, so called from Moscow, its center and capital, gradually extended its dominions until it became easily the first among all the Slavonic states. In 1470 the prince of Moscow annexed Novgorod

RUSSIA AND THE SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES AT THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES

the Mighty to his dominions. This new Russian power now felt itself strong enough to throw off the Tartar yoke.

It was under Ivan the Great (1462–1505) that Russia, — now frequently called Muscovy from the fact that it had been reorganized with Moscow as a center, — after a terrible struggle, succeeded in freeing itself from the hateful Tartar domination and began to assume the character of a well-consolidated monarchy. Thus by the end of the Middle Ages Russia had become a really

great power; but she was as yet too completely hemmed in by hostile states to be able to make her influence felt in the affairs of Europe.

VI. Italy

267. No National Government. — In marked contrast to all those countries of which we have thus far spoken, unless we except Germany, Italy came to the close of the Middle Ages without a national or regular government. This is to be attributed, as we have already learned, to a variety of causes, but in large part to that unfortunate rivalry between Pope and Emperor which resulted in dividing Italy into the two hostile camps of Guelph and Ghibelline.

And yet the mediæval period did not pass without attempts on the part of patriot spirits to effect some sort of political union among the different cities and states of the peninsula. The most noteworthy of these movements, and one which gave assurance that the spark of patriotism which was in time to flame into an inextinguishable passion for national unity was kindling in the Italian heart, was that headed by the patriot-hero Rienzi in the fourteenth century.

268. Rienzi, Tribune of Rome (1347). — During the greater part of the fourteenth century the seat of the papal see was at Avignon, beyond the Alps (sec. 169). Throughout this period of the "Babylonian Captivity," Rome, deprived of her natural guardians, was in a state of the greatest confusion. The nobles terrorized the country about the capital and kept the streets of the city itself in constant turmoil with their bitter feuds.

In the midst of these disorders there appeared from among the lowest ranks of the people a deliverer in the person of one Nicola di Rienzi. With imagination all aflame from long study of the records and monuments of the freedom and the glories of ancient Rome, he conceived the magnificent idea of not only delivering the capital from the wretchedness of the prevailing anarchy but also of restoring the city to its former proud position as head of Italy and mistress of the world.

Possessed of considerable talent and great eloquence, Rienzi easily incited the people to a revolt against the rule, or rather misrule, of the nobles, and succeeded in having himself, with the title of Tribune, placed at the head of a new government for Rome. In this position his power was virtually absolute. He forced the nobles into submission, and in a short time effected a most wonderful transformation in the city and surrounding country. Order and security took the place of disorder and violence. The best days of republican Rome seemed to have been suddenly restored. The enthusiasm of the Roman populace knew no limits. The remarkable revolution drew the attention of all Italy, and of the world beyond the peninsula as well.

Encouraged by the success that had thus far attended his schemes, Rienzi now began to concert measures for the union of all the principalities and commonwealths of Italy into a great republic, with Rome as its capital. He sent ambassadors throughout Italy to plead, at the courts of the princes and in the council chambers of the municipalities, the cause of Italian unity and freedom.

The splendid dream of Rienzi was shared by other Italian patriots besides himself, among whom was the poet Petrarch, who was the friend and encourager of the plebeian tribune, and who "wished part in the glorious work and in the lofty fame." "Could passion have listened to reason," says Gibbon, "could private welfare have yielded to the public welfare, the supreme tribunal and confederate union of the Italian republic might have healed the intestine discord and closed the Alps against the barbarians of the North."

But the moment for Italy's unification had not yet come. Not only were there hindrances to the national movement in the ambitions and passions of rival parties and classes, but there were still greater impediments in the character of the plebeian patriot himself. Rienzi proved to be an unworthy leader. His sudden elevation and surprising success completely turned his head, and he soon began to exhibit the most incredible vanity and weakness. The people withdrew from him their support; the Pope excommunicated him as a rebel and heretic; and the

nobles rose against him. He was finally killed in a sudden uprising of the populace (1354).

Thus vanished the dream of Rienzi and of Petrarch, of the hero and of the poet. Centuries of division, of shameful subjection to foreign princes, — French, Spanish, and Austrian, — of wars and suffering, were yet before the Italian people ere Rome should become the center of a free, orderly, and united Italy.

269. **The Five Great States.** — The unification of Italy was impossible; yet the later mediæval time witnessed a movement

ITALY ABOUT THE MIDDLE OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

in the direction of the consolidation of the numerous petty states of the northern and central regions into larger ones. By the middle of the fifteenth century the greater part of the peninsula

was gathered into five so-called Great States, — the duchy of Milan[23] and the two nominal republics of Venice and Florence in the north, the States of the Church in Central Italy, and the old Kingdom of Naples in the south.

The formation of these states and the establishment of a sort of balance of power between them hushed the savage quarrels of the individual cities and gave Italy finally a few years of comparative peace (1447–1492).

But these great states, like the smaller ones, were jealous of one another. It was their inability to act in concert that enabled the French king, Charles VIII, to march in such an extraordinary way from one end of the peninsula to the other (sec. 240). Thus was Italy again opened to the "barbarians" of the North. It was the beginning, as we have seen, of the foreign enslavement of the peninsula. For three centuries and more Italy was destined to be merely "a geographical expression."

270. The Renaissance. — Though the Middle Ages closed in Italy without the rise there of a national government, still before the end of the period much had been done to create those common ideals and sentiments upon which political unity can alone securely repose.

Literature and art here performed the part that war did in other countries in arousing a national pride and spirit. The Renaissance, of which we shall tell in the following chapter, with its awakenings and achievements, did much towards creating among the Italians a common pride in race and country; and thus this splendid literary and artistic enthusiasm was the first step in a course of national development which was to lead the Italian people, in the fullness of time, to a common political life.

Here, in connection with Italian Renaissance literature, a word will be in place respecting *The Prince*, by the Florentine historian Machiavelli. In this remarkable book the writer, imbued with a deep patriotic sentiment, points out the way in which, in the midst

[23] Milan was in the hands of the powerful family of the Visconti. The last of the house died in 1447, and was succeeded in 1450 by Francesco Sforza, the founder of the celebrated family of Sforza.

of the existing chaos, material and spiritual, Italy might be consolidated into a great state, like England or France or Spain.

The redeemer of Italy and the maker of the new state must be a strong despotic prince, who in the work must have no moral scruples whatever, but be ready to use all means, however cruel and unjust and wicked, which promised to further the end in view. After the prince had created a united Italy, then he must rule in righteousness as the representative of the people.

The way in which Machiavelli instructs the prince to build up a state out of the broken-down institutions of the Middle Ages was, in truth, the very way in which the despots of his time in Italy had actually created their principalities; but that he should have seriously advised any one to adopt their immoral statecraft soon raised against him and his teachings, especially in the North, a storm of protest and denunciation which has not yet subsided. Machiavelli found disciples enough, however, so that his work had a vast though malign influence in molding the political morality of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

FIG. 46. — SAVONAROLA. (After an engraving by *Leonardo da Vinci* in Vienna Museum)

271. Savonarola (1452–1498). — A word must here be said respecting the Florentine monk and reformer Girolamo Savonarola, who stands as the most noteworthy personage in Italy during the closing years of the mediæval period.

Savonarola was at once Roman censor and Hebrew prophet. His powerful preaching alarmed the conscience of the Florentines. At his suggestion the women brought their finery and ornaments, and others their beautiful works of art, and, piling them in great heaps in the streets of Florence, burned them as vanities. Savonarola even urged that the government of Florence be made a

theocracy and Christ be proclaimed king. But finally the activity of his enemies brought about the reformer's downfall, and he was condemned to death, strangled, his body burned, and his ashes thrown into the Arno.

Savonarola may be regarded as the last great mediæval forerunner of the reformers of the sixteenth century. Yet he must not be thought of as a reformer in the same sense that Luther, for instance, was. He was not a precursor of Protestantism. He stood firmly on Catholic ground. He believed the Papacy to be a divine institution. He wished, it is true, to reform the Church, but he had no quarrel with its doctrines or its form of government.

VII. The Northern Countries

272. **The Union of Calmar** (1397). — The great Scandinavian Exodus of the ninth and tenth centuries drained the Northern lands of some of the best elements of their population. For this reason these countries did not play as prominent a part in mediæval history as they probably would otherwise have done. The constant contentions between the nobility and their sovereigns were also another cause of internal weakness.

In the year 1397, by what is known as the Union of Calmar, the three kingdoms of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden were united under Margaret of Denmark, "the Semiramis of the North." The treaty provided that each country should retain its constitution and make its own laws. But the treaty was violated, and though the friends of the measure had hoped much from it, it brought only jealousies, feuds, and wars.

Thus the history of these Northern countries during the later mediæval time presents nothing of primary interest which calls for narration here; but early in the Modern Age we shall see Sweden developing rapidly as an independent monarchy and for a period playing an important part in European affairs.

Selections from the Sources. — Lanier, *The Boy's Froissart*, being Sir John Froissart's *Chronicles* edited for boys. Read chaps. lxxviii–lxxxiv, on the battle of Poitiers and after. *Aucassin and Nicolette* (trans.

by Andrew Lang); this is the most exquisite love story, in prose and verse, preserved to us from the land and the age of the Troubadours. HENDERSON, *Select Historical Documents*, pp. 1–168. *Old South Leaflets*, No. 5, "Magna Charta." KENDALL, *Source-Book*, chaps. v–vii. COLBY, *Selections*, Extracts 22–52. *Translations and Reprints*, vol. ii, No. 5, "England in the Time of Wycliffe" (ed. by Edward P. Cheyney).

Secondary Works.—(1) Works of a general character: FREEMAN, *Historical Geography of Europe*, 2 vols. (vol. ii consists of maps). GUIZOT, *History of Civilization in Europe*, Lects. ix and xi. WILSON, *The State;* has valuable chapters on the development of the governmental institutions of the leading states. LODGE, *The Close of the Middle Ages, 1273–1494*. ADAMS, *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. xiii, "The Formation of France," and chap. xiv, "England and the Other States."

(2) National histories: The Story of the Nations series contains convenient volumes on each of the chief European states. GREEN, *History of the English People*, parts of vols. i and ii. KITCHIN, *History of France*, vol. i. HENDERSON, *History of Germany in the Middle Ages*. HASSALL, *The French People*. HUME, *The Spanish People*. GARDINER'S, COMAN and KENDALL'S, MONTGOMERY'S, TERRY'S, ANDREWS', and CHEYNEY'S histories of England and DURUY'S *History of France* are excellent single-volume text-books.

(3) Biographies and books on special topics: In the Epochs of Modern History and the Heroes of the Nations series are to be found separate volumes covering many of the matters, political and biographical, touched upon in the present chapter. LOWELL, *Joan of Arc*. TREVELYAN, *England in the Age of Wycliffe;* furnishes the best account we possess of the Peasants' Revolt. POOLE, *Wycliffe and Movements for Reform*. GASQUET, *The Great Pestilence*. CHEYNEY, *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England*, chap. v, "The Black Death and the Peasants' Rebellion." For English constitutional matters the student should consult STUBBS', TASWELL-LANGMEAD'S, MACY'S, and TAYLOR'S works. SMITH, *The Troubadours at Home;* the best work in our language on the subject with which it deals. MRS. OLIPHANT, *The Makers of Florence*. LEA, *A History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*. KIRK, *History of Charles the Bold;* a notable work. PRESCOTT, *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*. IRVING, *The Conquest of Granada*. KENYON, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*. GASQUET, *The Old English Bible and Other Essays*.

Topics for Class Reports.—1. Thomas Becket. 2. William Wallace of Scotland. 3. The Black Death. 4. Joan of Arc. 5. Character of Louis XI of France. 6. Charles the Bold of Burgundy. 7. The fall of Granada. 8. The Sicilian Vespers. 9. Savonarola.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE RENAISSANCE

I. The Beginnings of the Renaissance

273. The Renaissance defined. — By the term *Renaissance* ("New Birth"), used in its narrower sense, is meant that new enthusiasm for classical literature, learning, and art which sprang up in Italy towards the close of the Middle Ages, and which during the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries gave a new culture to Europe.[1]

Using the word in a somewhat broader sense, we may define the Renaissance as the reëntrance into the world of that secular, inquiring, self-reliant spirit which characterized the life and culture of classical antiquity. This is simply to say that under the influence of the intellectual revival the men of Western Europe came to think and feel, to look upon life and the outer world, as did the men of ancient Greece and Rome; and this again is merely to say that they ceased to think and feel as mediæval men and began to think and feel as modern men.

274. The Crusades in their Relation to the Renaissance. — Many agencies conspired to bring in the Renaissance. Among these were the Crusades. These long-sustained enterprises, as we pointed out in summarizing their effects (sec. 159), contributed essentially to break the mental lethargy that had fallen upon the European mind, and to awaken in the nations of Western Europe the spirit of a new life. Before the Crusades closed, the

[1] By many writers the term is employed in a still narrower sense than this, being used to designate merely the revival of classical art; but this is to depreciate the most important phase of a many-sided development. The Renaissance was essentially an intellectual movement. It is this intellectual quality which gives it so large a place in universal history.

way of the Renaissance was already prepared. In every territory of human activity the paths along which advances were to be made by the men of coming generations had been marked out, and in many directions trodden by the eager feet of the pioneers of the new life and culture.

275. The Development of Vernacular Literatures as an Expression of the New Spirit. — The awakening of this new spirit in the Western nations is especially observable in the growth and development of their vernacular literatures. It was, speaking broadly, during and just after the crusading centuries that the native tongues of Europe found a voice, — began to form literatures of their own. We have in another place spoken of the formation and gradual growth of some of the most important of these languages (sec. 44). As soon as their forms became somewhat settled, then literature was possible, and all these speeches bud and blossom into song and romance. In Spain the epic poem of the *Cid*, a reflection of Castilian chivalry, forms the beginning of Spanish literature; in the south of France the Troubadours fill the land with the melody of their love songs; in the north the Trouveurs recite the stirring romances of Charlemagne and his paladins, of King Arthur and the Holy Grail; in Germany the harsh strains of the *Nibelungenlied* are followed by the softer notes of the Minnesingers; in Italy Dante sings his *Divine Comedy* in the pure mellifluous tongue of Tuscany, and creates a language for the Italian race; in England Chaucer writes his *Canterbury Tales* and completes the fusion of Saxon and Norman into the English tongue.

This growth of native literatures foreshadowed the approaching Renaissance; for there was in them a note of freedom, a note of protest against mediæval asceticism and ecclesiastical restraint. And at the same time that this literary development heralded the coming intellectual revival it hastened its advance; for the light songs, tales, and romances of these vernacular literatures, unlike the learned productions of the Schoolmen, which were in Latin and addressed only to a limited class, appealed to the masses and thus stirred the universal mind and heart of Europe.

276. Town Life and Lay Culture. — The spirit of the new life was nourished especially by the air of the great cities. In speaking of mediæval town life we noticed how within the towns there was early developed a life like that of modern times. The atmosphere of these bustling, trafficking cities called into existence a practical commercial spirit, a many-sided, independent, secular life which in many respects was directly opposed to mediæval teachings and ideals.

This intellectual and social movement within the mediæval towns, especially in the great city-republics of Italy, was related most intimately, as we shall see in a moment (sec. 279), to that great revival of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to which the term Renaissance is distinctively applied.

277. Dante as a Forerunner of the Renaissance. —We have already spoken the name of Dante, but the great place he holds in the intellectual history of the race requires that we should speak with some detail of the relation which he sustained to the age which, just as he appeared, was passing away, and to the new age which was then approaching.

FIG. 47. — DANTE. (From a portrait by *S. Tofanelli*)

Dante Alighieri, "the fame of the Tuscan people," was born at Florence in 1265. He was exiled by the Florentines in 1302, and at the courts of friends learned how hard a thing it is "to climb the stairway of a patron." He died at Ravenna in 1321, and his tomb there is a place of pilgrimage to-day.

It was during the years of his exile that Dante wrote his immortal poem, the *Commedia* as named by himself, because of its happy ending; the *Divina Commedia*, or the "Divine Comedy," as called by his admirers. This poem has been called the "Epic of Mediævalism." It is an epitome of the life and thought of the Middle Ages. Dante's theology is the theology of the mediæval Church; his philosophy is the philosophy of the Schoolmen; his science is the science of his time.

But although Dante viewed the world from a standpoint which was essentially that of the mediæval age which was passing away, still he was in a profound sense a prophet of the new age which was approaching, — a forerunner of the Renaissance. He was such in his feeling for classical antiquity. When he speaks lovingly of Vergil as his teacher and master, the one from whom he took the beautiful style that had done him honor, he reveals how he has come to look with other than mediæval eyes upon the Augustan poet. His modern attitude towards Græco-Roman culture is further shown in his free use of the works of the classical writers; the illustrative material of his great poem is drawn almost as largely from classical as from Hebrew and Christian sources. Again, in his self-reliant judgment, in his critical spirit, in his mental independence, Dante exhibits intellectual traits which we recognize as belonging rather to the modern than to the mediæval man.

278. **The Fresh Stimulus from the Side of Classical Antiquity.** — We have now reached the opening of the fourteenth century. Just at this time the intellectual progress of Europe received a tremendous impulse from the more perfect recovery of the inestimable treasures of the civilization of Græco-Roman antiquity. So far-reaching and transforming was the influence of the old world of culture upon the nations of Western Europe that the Renaissance, viewed as the transition from the mediæval to the modern age, may properly be regarded as beginning with its discovery, or rediscovery, and the appropriation of its riches by the Italian scholars. In the following sections we shall try to give some account of this Renaissance movement in its earlier stages and as it manifested itself in Italy.

II. The Renaissance in Italy

279. **Inciting Causes of the Movement.** — Just as the Reformation went forth from Germany and the Political Revolution from France, so did the Renaissance go forth from Italy. And this was not an accident. The Renaissance had its real beginnings in Italy for the reason that all those agencies which were slowly transforming the mediæval into the modern world were here more active and effective in their workings than elsewhere.

Foremost among these agencies must be placed the influence of the Italian cities. We have already seen how city life was more perfectly developed in Italy than in the other countries of Western Europe. In the air of the great Italian city-republics there was nourished a strong, self-reliant, secular, myriad-sided life. It was a political, intellectual, and artistic life like that of the cities of ancient Greece. Florence, for example, became a second Athens, and in the eager air of that city individual talent and faculty were developed as of old in the atmosphere of the Attic capital. "In Florence," says Symonds, "had been produced such glorious human beings as the world has rarely seen. . . . The whole population formed an aristocracy of genius."

In a word, life in Italy earlier than elsewhere lost its mediæval characteristics and assumed those of the modern type. We may truly say that the Renaissance was cradled in the cities of mediæval Italy. The Italians, to use again the words of Symonds, were "the firstborn among the sons of modern Europe."

A second circumstance that doubtless contributed to make Italy the birthplace of the Renaissance was the fact that in Italy the break between the old and the new civilization was not so complete as it was in the other countries of Western Europe. The Italians were closer in language and in blood to the old Romans than were the other new-forming nations. They regarded themselves as the direct descendants and heirs of the old conquerors of the world. This consciousness of kinship with the men of a great past exerted an immense influence upon the imagination of the Italians and tended not only to preserve the continuity of

the historical development in the peninsula but also to set as the first task of the Italian scholars the recovery and appropriation of the culture of antiquity.

But more potent than all other agencies, not so much in awakening the Italian intellect as in determining the direction of its activities after they were once aroused by other inciting causes, was the existence in the peninsula of so many monuments of the civilization and the grandeur of ancient Rome. The cities themselves were, in a very exact sense, fragments of the old Empire; and everywhere in the peninsula the ground was covered with ruins of the old Roman builders. The influence which these reminders of a glorious past exerted upon sensitive souls is well illustrated by the biographies of such men as Rienzi and Petrarch.

280. The Two Phases of the Italian Renaissance. — It was, as we have already intimated, the nearness of the Italians to the classical past that caused the Renaissance in Italy to assume essentially the character of a classical revival, — a recovery and appropriation by the Italians of the long-neglected heritage of Græco-Roman civilization.

The movement here consisted of two distinct yet closely related phases, namely, the revival of classical literature and learning, and the revival of classical art. It is with the first only, the intellectual and literary phase of the movement, that we shall be chiefly concerned. This feature of the movement is called distinctively "Humanism," and the promoters of it are known as "Humanists," because of their interest in the study of the classics, the *literæ humaniores*, or the "more human letters," in opposition to the diviner letters, that is, theology, which made up the old education.

281. Petrarch,[2] the First of the Humanists. — "Not only in the history of Italian literature but in that of the civilized world, and not only in this but in the history of the human mind . . . Petrarch's name shines as a star of the first magnitude."[3]

[2] Francesco Petrarca (1304–1374). Petrarch is best known to most as the writer of Italian sonnets, but his significance for general history is due almost wholly to his relation to the revival of classic learning in Italy, and consequently it is only of this phase of his activity that we shall speak.

[3] Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums*, 3d ed., vol. i, p. 22.

It is in such words as these that one of the greatest historians of humanism speaks of Petrarch and his place in the history of the intellectual progress of the race. It will be worth our while to try to understand what Petrarch was in himself and what he did which justifies such an appraisement of his significance for universal history. To understand Petrarch is to understand the Renaissance.

Petrarch was the first and greatest representative of the humanistic phase of the Italian Renaissance. He was the first scholar of the mediæval time who fully realized and appreciated the supreme excellence and beauty of the classical literature and its value as a means of culture. His enthusiasm for the ancient writers was a sort of worship. At great cost of time and labor he made a collection of about two hundred manuscript volumes of the classics. Among his choicest Latin treasures were some of Cicero's letters, which he had himself discovered in an old library at Verona, and reverently copied with his own hand. He could not read Greek, yet he gathered Greek as well as Latin manuscripts. He had sixteen works of Plato and a revered copy of Homer sent him from Constantinople; and thus, as he himself expressed it, the first of poets and the first of philosophers took up their abode with him.

FIG. 48. — PETRARCH. (From a portrait by *S. Tofanelli*)

This last sentiment reveals Petrarch's feeling for his books. The spirits of their authors seemed to him to surround him in

his quiet library, and he was never so happy as when holding converse with these choice souls of the past. Often he wrote letters to the old worthies, — Homer, Cicero, Vergil, Seneca, and the rest, — for Petrarch loved thus to record his thoughts, and spent much of his time in the recreation of letter writing; for recreation, and life itself, letter writing was to him.

Petrarch's enthusiasm for the classical authors became contagious. Fathers reproached him for enticing their sons from the study of the law to the reading of the classics and the writing of Latin verses. But the movement started by Petrarch could not be checked. The impulse he imparted to humanistic studies is still felt in the world of letters and learning.

282. **Petrarch's Feeling for the Ruins of Rome.** — Petrarch had for the material monuments of classical antiquity a feeling akin to that which he had for its literary memorials.

The men of the real mediæval time had no intelligent curiosity or feeling respecting the monuments and ruins of the ancient world. Their attitude towards all these things was exactly the same as that of the modern Arabs and Turks towards the remains of past civilizations in the lands of the Orient. To these degenerate successors of masterful races the ruins of Nineveh and Babylon are convenient brick quarries, and nothing more. They are absolutely indifferent respecting all that great past to which these vast ruins bear silent and melancholy witness. How different is it with us, children of the Renaissance, as we dig in those same mounds, carefully and reverently gathering up every fragment of lettered stone or brick that may tell us something of the thoughts and feelings and deeds of those men of the early time!

All this illustrates perfectly the difference between the mediæval man and the man of the Renaissance. During all the mediæval centuries, until the dawn of the intellectual revival, the ruins of Rome were merely a quarry. The monuments of the Cæsars were torn down for building material, the sculptured marbles were burned into lime for mortar.

Now, Petrarch was one of the first men of mediæval times who had for the ruins of Rome the modern feeling. "He tells us how

often with Giovanni Colonna he ascended the mighty vaults of the Baths of Diocletian, and there in the transparent air, amid the wide silence, with the broad panorama stretching far around them, they spoke, not of business, or political affairs, but of the history which the ruins beneath their feet suggested." [4]

283. **Boccaccio, the Disciple of Petrarch.** — Petrarch called into existence a school of ardent young humanists who looked up to him as their master, and who carried on with unbounded enthusiasm the work of exploring the new spiritual hemisphere which he had discovered. Most distinguished among these disciples was Boccaccio (1313–1375), whose wide fame rests chiefly on his *Decameron*, a collection of tales written in Italian, but whose work as a humanist alone has interest for us in the present connection.

Boccaccio did much to spread and to deepen the enthusiasm for antiquity that Petrarch had awakened. He industriously collected and copied ancient manuscripts and thus greatly promoted classical scholarship in Italy. Imitating Petrarch, he tried to learn Greek, but, like Petrarch, made very little progress towards the mastery of the language because of the incompetence of his teacher and also because of the utter lack of text-books, grammars, and dictionaries. He persuaded his teacher, however, to make a Latin translation of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and was thus instrumental in giving to the world the first modern translation of Homer. It was a wretched version, yet it served to inspire in the Italian scholars an intense desire to know at first hand Greek literature, — that literature from which the old Roman authors had admittedly drawn their inspiration.

[4] Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, p. 177. Petrarch represents still other phases and qualities of the modern spirit, upon which, however, it is impossible for us to dwell. Regarding his feeling for nature in her grand and romantic aspects, we must nevertheless say a single word. One of the most remarkable passages in his writings is his description of his ascent of Mount Ventoux, near Avignon, for the sake of the view from the top. This was the beginning of the mountain climbing of modern times, — a new thing in the world. There was very little of it in antiquity, and during the Middle Ages apparently none at all. Even Dante always speaks of the mountains with a shudder. Nothing distinguishes the modern from the mediæval man more sharply than this new feeling for nature in her wilder and grander moods.

284. **The Italians are taught Greek by Chrysoloras.** — This desire of the Italian scholars was soon gratified. Just at the close of the fourteenth century the Eastern Emperor sent an embassy to Italy to beg aid against the Turks. The commission was headed by Manuel Chrysoloras, an eminent Greek scholar. No sooner had he landed at Venice than the Florentines sent him a pressing invitation to come to their city. He acceded to their request, was received by them with such honor as they might have shown a celestial being, and was given a professor's chair in the university (1396). Young and old thronged his class room. Men past sixty "felt the blood leap in their veins" at the thought of being able to learn Greek.

The appearance of Chrysoloras as a teacher at Florence marks the revival, after seven centuries of neglect, of the study of the Greek language and literature in the schools of Western Europe. This meant much. It meant the revival of civilization, the opening of the modern age; for of all the agencies concerned in transforming the mediæval into the modern world one of the most potent certainly was Greek culture.[5]

285. **The Search for Old Manuscripts.** — Having now spoken of the pioneers of Italian humanism in the fourteenth century, we can, in our remaining space, touch only in a very general way upon the most important phases of the humanistic movement in the following century.

The first concern of the Italian scholars was to rescue from threatened oblivion what yet remained of the ancient classics. Just as the antiquarians of to-day dig over the mounds of Assyria for relics of the ancient civilization of the East, so did the humanists ransack the libraries of the monasteries and cathedrals and search through all the out-of-the-way places of Europe for old manuscripts of the classic writers.

The precious manuscripts were often discovered in a shameful state of neglect and in advanced stages of decay. Sometimes

[5] "If it be true [as has been asserted] that except the blind forces of nature nothing moves in this world which is not Greek in its origin, we are justified in regarding the point of contact between the Greek teacher Chrysoloras and his Florentine pupils as one of the most momentous crises in the history of civilization." — SYMONDS

they were found covered with mold in damp cells or loaded with dust in the attics of monasteries. Again they were discovered, as by Boccaccio in the manuscript room of the Benedictine monastery of Monte Cassino, mutilated in various ways, some, for instance, with the borders of the parchment pared away, and others with whole leaves lacking.[6]

This late search of the humanists for the works of the ancient authors saved to the world many precious manuscripts which, a little longer neglected, would have been forever lost.

286. Patrons of the New Learning; the Founding of Libraries. — This gathering and copying of the ancient manuscripts was costly in time and labor. But there was many a Mæcenas to encourage and further the work. Merchant princes, despots, and popes became generous patrons of the humanists. Prominent among these promoters of the New Learning, as it was called, were Cosimo and Lorenzo de' Medici at Florence. It was largely due to their genuine and enlightened interest in the great undertaking of recovering for culture the ancient classical literatures that Florence became the foster home of the intellectual and literary revival.

Among the papal promoters of the movement Pope Nicholas V (1447–1455) was one of the most noted. He sent out explorers to all parts of the West to search for manuscripts, and kept busy at Rome a multitude of copyists and translators. A little later Pope Julius II (1503–1513) and Pope Leo X (1513–1521) made Rome a brilliant center of Renaissance art and learning.

Libraries were founded where the new treasures might be safely stored and made accessible to scholars. In this movement some of the largest libraries of Italy had their beginnings. At Florence the Medici established the fine existing Medicean Library. At Rome Pope Nicholas V enriched the original papal collection of

[6] This mutilation was due chiefly to the scarcity of writing material, which led the mediæval copyists to erase the original text of old parchments that they might use them a second time. In this way many works of classical authors were destroyed. Sometimes, however, the earlier text was so imperfectly obliterated that by means of chemical reagents it can be wholly or partially restored. Such twice-written manuscripts are called *palimpsests*.

books by the addition, it is said, of fully five thousand manuscripts, and thus became the real founder of the celebrated Vatican Library of the present day.

287. How the Fall of Constantinople aided the Revival. — The humanistic movement, especially in so far as it concerned Greek letters and learning, was given a great impulse by the disasters which in the fifteenth century befell the Eastern Empire. Constantinople, it will be recalled, was captured by the Ottoman Turks in 1453. But for a half century before that event the threatening advance of the barbarians had caused a great migration of Greek scholars to the West. So many of the exiles sought an asylum in Italy that one could say: "Greece has not fallen; she has migrated to Italy, which in ancient times bore the name of Magna Græcia."

These fugitives brought with them many valuable manuscripts of the ancient Greek classics still unknown to Western scholars. The enthusiasm of the Italians for everything Greek led to the appointment of many of the exiles as teachers and lecturers in their schools and universities. Thus there was now a repetition of what took place at Rome in the days of the later republic; Italy was conquered a second time by the genius of Greece.

288. Translation and Criticism of the Classics. — The recovery of the ancient classics, their multiplication by copyists, and their preservation in libraries was only the first and lightest part of the task which the Italian humanists set themselves. The most difficult and significant part of their work lay in the comparison and correction of texts, the translation into Latin of the Greek manuscripts, and the interpretation and criticism of the ancient literatures now recovered.

Among the Italian scholars who devoted themselves to this work a foremost place must be assigned to Politian (1454–1494), a man of remarkable genius and learning. Almost all the noted humanists in Europe of his own and the following generation seem to have caught their inspiration in his lecture room.[7]

[7] Another name of great renown connected with these fifteenth-century labors of the Italian scholars is that of Pico della Mirandola (1463–1494), a man of extraordinary

289. The Invention of Printing. — During the latter part of the fifteenth century the work of the Italian humanists was greatly furthered by the happy and timely invention of the art of printing from movable letters, the most important discovery, in the estimation of Hallam, recorded in the annals of mankind.

The making of impressions by means of engraved seals or blocks seems to be a device as old as civilization. The Chinese have practiced this form of printing from an early time. The art appears to have sprung up independently in Europe during the later mediæval period. First, devices on playing cards were formed by impressions from blocks; then manuscripts were stamped with portraits and pictures. The next step was to cut into the same block a few lines of explanatory text. In time the lines increased to pages, and during the first half of the fifteenth century many entire books were produced by the block-printing method.



FIG. 49. — A BLOCK-PRINTED PAGE FROM THE "BIBLIA PAUPERUM" (From *Lacroix*)

But printing from blocks was slow and costly. The art was revolutionized by John Gutenberg (1400–1468), a native of Mainz in Germany, through the invention of the movable letters which we call type.[8] The oldest book known to have been printed from movable

gifts of mind. The special task which Pico set for himself was the harmonizing of Christianity and the New Learning, a task like that of those scholars of the present time who seek to reconcile the Bible and modern science.

[8] Some Dutch writers claim for Coster of Haarlem the honor of the invention, but there is nothing aside from unreliable tradition on which such a claim can rest.

letters was a Latin copy of the Bible issued from the press of Gutenberg and Faust at Mainz between the years 1454 and 1456. The art spread rapidly and before the close of the fifteenth century presses were busy in every country of Europe — in the city of Venice alone there were two hundred — multiplying books with a rapidity undreamed of by the patient copyists of the cloister.

290. **The Aldine Press at Venice.** — But it is merely the introduction of the new art into Italy that especially concerns us now.

FIG. 50. — THE PRINTING OF BOOKS. (From *Early Venetian Printing*)

The little that our brief space will permit us to say on this subject gathers about the name of Aldus Manutius (1450–1515), who established at Venice a celebrated printing house, known as the Aldine Press, the story of which forms one of the earliest and most interesting chapters in the history of the new art in its relation to humanism.

In the course of a few years Aldus had given to the appreciative scholars of Europe an almost complete series of the Greek authors. Besides these Greek editions he issued both Latin and Hebrew texts. Altogether he printed over a hundred works. In

quality of paper and in clearness and beauty of type his editions have never been surpassed.

The work of the Aldine Press at Venice, in connection of course with what was done by presses of less note in other places, made complete the recovery of the classical literatures, and by scattering broadcast throughout Europe the works of the ancient authors rendered it impossible that any part of them should ever again become lost to the world.



FIG. 51. — CASE OF CHAINED BOOKS. (From Clarke, *The Care of Books*)

The case shown is preserved in the Chapter Library, Hertford, England. In some libraries this practice of chaining the books was kept up even in the eighteenth century

291. Humanism crosses the Alps. — As early as the middle of the fifteenth century the German youths had begun to cross the Alps in order to study Greek at the feet of the masters there. As the type and representative of these young German humanists we may name Reuchlin, who in 1482 journeyed to Italy and presented himself there before a celebrated teacher of Greek. As a test of his knowledge of the language he was given to translate a passage from Thucydides. The young barbarian — for by this term the Italians of that time expressed their contempt for an inhabitant of the rude North — turned the lines so easily and masterfully that the examiner, who was a native-born Greek, cried out in astonishment, "Our exiled Greece has flown beyond the Alps."

In transalpine Europe the humanistic movement became blended with other tendencies. In Italy it had been an almost exclusive devotion to Greek and Latin letters and learning; but in the North there was added to this enthusiasm for classical culture an equal and indeed supreme interest in Hebrew and Christian antiquity. Hence here the literary and intellectual revival became, in the profoundest sense, the moving cause of the great religious revolution known as the Reformation, and it is in connection with the beginnings of that movement that we shall find a place to speak of the humanists of Germany and the other northern lands.

292. The Artistic Revival. — As we have already seen, the new feeling for classical antiquity awakened among the Italians embraced not simply the literary and philosophical side of the Græco-Roman culture, but the artistic side as well. Respecting this latter phase of the Italian Renaissance it will be impossible for us to speak in detail, nor is it necessary for us to do so, since the chief significance of the Renaissance for universal history, as already noted, is to be sought in the purely intellectual movement traced in the preceding pages of this chapter.

The artistic revival was in its essence a return of art to nature; for mediæval art lacked freedom and naturalness. The artist was hampered by ecclesiastical tradition and restraint; he was, moreover, under the influence of the religious asceticism of the time. His models as a rule were the stiff, angular, lifeless forms of Byzantine art, or the gaunt, pinched bodies of saints and anchorites. In the decoration of the walls, pulpits, and altars of the churches he was not at liberty, even if he had the impulse, to depart from the consecrated traditional types.[9]

Now, what the Renaissance did for art was to liberate it from these trammels and to breathe into its dead forms the spirit of that new life which was everywhere awakening. This emancipation movement took place largely under impulses which came

[9] In the Greek Church at the present time the artist in the portrayal of sacred subjects is not permitted to change the traditional expression or attitude of his figures.

from a study of the masterpieces of ancient art. Thus did classical antiquity exercise the same influence in the emancipation and revival of art as in the emancipation and revival of letters.[10]

293. Why Painting was the Supreme Art of the Italian Renaissance.[11] — The characteristic art of the Italian Renaissance was painting, and for the reason that it best expresses the ideas and sentiments of Christianity. The art that would be the handmaid of the Church needed to be able to represent faith and hope, ecstasy and suffering,—none of which things can well be expressed by sculpture, which is essentially the art of repose.



FIG. 52. — TOMB AT TOURS OF THE CHILDREN OF CHARLES VIII. (From a photograph)

Showing the influence of ancient classical art upon the art of the Renaissance

Sculpture was the chief art of the Greeks, because among them the aim of the artist was to represent physical beauty or strength. But the problem of the Christian artist is to express spiritual emotion or feeling through the medium of the body. This cannot be represented in cold, colorless marble. Thus, as Symonds asks, "How could the Last Judgment be expressed in plastic form?" The chief events of Christ's life removed him beyond the reach of sculpture.

[10] In the list of Italian sculptors the following names are especially noteworthy: Ghiberti (1378–1455), whose genius is shown in his celebrated bronze gates of the Baptistery at Florence, of which Michael Angelo said that they were worthy to be the gates of Paradise; Brunelleschi (1377–1444), Donatello (1386–1466), and Michael Angelo (1475–1564).

[11] The views presented in this paragraph are those of Symonds in his work on *The Fine Arts*, which forms the third volume of his *Renaissance in Italy*.

Therefore, because sculpture has so little power to express emotion, painting, which runs so easily the entire gamut of feeling, became the chosen medium of expression of the Italian artist. This art alone enabled him to portray the raptures of the saint, the sweet charm of the Madonna, the intense passion of the Christ, the moving terrors of the Last Judgment.

294. The Four Masters; Mingling of Christian and Classical Subjects. — The four supreme masters of Italian Renaissance painting were Leonardo da Vinci[12] (1452–1519), whose masterpiece is his *Last Supper*, on the wall of a convent at Milan; Raphael (1483–1520), the best beloved of artists, whose Madonnas are counted among the world's treasures; Michael Angelo[13] (1475–1564), whose best paintings are his wonderful frescoes, among them the *Last Judgment*, in the Sistine Chapel at Rome; and Titian[14] (1477–1576), the Venetian master, celebrated for his portraits, which have preserved for us in flesh and blood, so to speak, many of the most noteworthy personages of his time.

The earlier Italian painters drew their subjects chiefly from Christian sources. They literally covered the walls of the churches, palaces, and civic buildings of Italy with pictorial representations of all the ideas and imaginings of the mediæval ages respecting death, the judgment, heaven, and hell. As Symonds tersely expresses it, they did by means of pictures what Dante had done by means of poetry.

The later artists, more under the influence of the classical revival, mingled freely pagan and Christian subjects and motives,

[12] Leonardo da Vinci was, in his many-sidedness and versatility, a true child of the Italian Renaissance; he was at once painter, sculptor, architect, poet, musician, and scientist.

[13] Michael Angelo, as we have seen, was an architect and sculptor as well as a painter. He is the only modern sculptor who can be given a place alongside the greatest sculptors of ancient Greece.

[14] A longer list of the most eminent Italian painters would include at least the following names: Cimabue (about 1240–1302) and Giotto (1276–1337), precursors of the revival; Fra Angelico (1387–1455); Correggio (about 1494–1534); Tintoretto (1518–1594) and Veronese (about 1530–1588), representatives of the Renaissance proper.

and thus became truer representatives than their predecessors of the Renaissance movement, one important issue of which was to be the reconciliation and blending of pagan and Christian culture.

295. The Paganism of the Italian Renaissance. — There was a religious and moral, or, as usually expressed, an irreligious and immoral, side to the classical revival in Italy which cannot be passed wholly unnoticed even in so brief an account of the movement as the present sketch.

In the first place, the study of the pagan poets and philosophers produced the exact result predicted by a certain party in the Church. It proved hurtful to religious faith. Men became pagans in their feelings and in their way of thinking. Italian scholars and Italian society almost ceased to be Christian in any true sense of the word.

With the New Learning came also those vices and immoralities that characterized the decline of classical civilization. Italy was corrupted by the new influences that flowed in upon her, just as Rome was corrupted by Grecian luxury and sensuality in the days of the failing republic. Much of the literature of the time is even more grossly immoral in tone than the literature of the age of classical decadence.

III. General Effects of the Renaissance

296. The Renaissance brought in New Conceptions of Life and the World. — The Renaissance effected in the Christian West an intellectual and moral revolution so profound and so far-reaching in its consequences that it may well be likened to that produced in the ancient world by the incoming of Christianity. The New Learning was indeed a New Gospel. Like Christianity, the Renaissance revealed to men another world, another state of existence; for such was the real significance, to the men of the revival, of the discovery of the civilization of classical antiquity. Through this discovery they learned that this earthly life is worth living for its own sake; that this life and its pleasures need not be contemned and sacrificed in order to make sure of eternal life in

another world; and that man may think and investigate and satisfy his thirst to know without endangering the welfare of his soul.[15]

These discoveries made by the men of the Renaissance gave a vast impulse to the progress of the human race. They inspired humanity with a new spirit, a spirit destined in time to make things new in all realms, — in the realm of religion, of politics, of literature, of art, of science, of invention, of industry. Some of these changes and revolutions we shall briefly indicate in the remaining sections of this chapter. To follow them out more in detail in all the territories of human activity and achievement will be our aim in later chapters, where we propose to trace the course of the historical development through the centuries of the Modern Age, — the great age opened by the Renaissance.

297. **It restored the Broken Unity of History.** — When Christianity entered the ancient Græco-Roman world war declared itself at once between the new religion and classical culture, especially between it and Hellenism. The Church, soon triumphant over paganism, rejected the bequest of antiquity. Some of the elements of that heritage were, it is true, appropriated by the men of the mediæval time and thus came to enrich the new Christian culture; but, as a whole, it was cast aside as pagan, and neglected. Thus was the unity of the historical development broken.

Now, through the liberal tendencies and generous enthusiasms of the Renaissance there was effected a reconciliation between

[15] The longings and the superstitious fears of men in the age of transition between mediæval and modern times is well epitomized in the tradition of Dr. Faustus. "That legend," says Symonds, "tells us what the men upon the eve of the Revival longed for, and what they dreaded, when they turned their minds toward the past. The secret of enjoyment and the source of strength possessed by the ancients allured them; but they believed that they could only recover this lost treasure by the suicide of the soul. So great was the temptation that Faustus paid the price. After imbibing all the knowledge of the age, he sold himself to the devil, in order that his thirst for experience might be quenched, his grasp upon the world be strengthened, and the ennui of his activity be soothed. His first use of his dearly-bought power was to make blind Homer sing to him. Amphion tunes his harp in concert with Mephistopheles. Alexander rises from the dead at his behest, with all his legionaries; and Helen is given to him for a bride. Faustus is therefore a parable of the impotent yearnings of the spirit in the Middle Ages, — its passionate aspiration, its conscience stricken desire, its fettered curiosity amid the cramping limits of impotent knowledge and irrational dogmatisms." — *Revival of Learning*, p. 53 (ed. 1888).

Christianity and classical civilization. There took place a fusion of their qualities and elements. The broken unity of history was restored. The cleft between the ancient and the modern world was closed. The severed branch was reunited to the old trunk.

The importance for universal history of this restoration of its broken unity, of this recovery by the Modern Age of the long-neglected culture of antiquity, can hardly be overestimated; for that culture had in its keeping not only the best the human race had thought and felt in the period of the highest reach of its powers, but also the precious scientific stores accumulated by all the ancient peoples. What the recovery and appropriation of all this meant for the world is suggested by ex-President Woolsey in these words: "The old civilization contained treasures of permanent value which the world could not spare, which the world will never be able or willing to spare. These were taken up into the stream of life, and proved true aids to the progress of a culture which is gathering in one the beauty and truth of all the ages."

298. **It reformed Education.** — The humanistic revival revolutionized education. During the Middle Ages the Latin language had degenerated, for the most part, into a barbarous jargon, while the Greek had been forgotten and the Aristotelian philosophy perverted. As to Plato, he was practically unknown to the mediæval thinkers. Now humanism restored to the world the pure classical Latin, rediscovered the Greek language, and recovered for civilization the once-rejected heritage of the ancient classics, including the Platonic philosophy, which was to be a quickening and uplifting force in modern thought.

The schools and universities did not escape the influences of this humanistic revival. Chairs in both the Greek and Latin languages and literatures were now established, not only in the new universities which arose under the inspiration of the New Learning, but also in the old ones. The scholastic method of instruction, of which we spoke in a preceding chapter, was gradually superseded by this so-called classical system of education, which dominated the schools and universities of the world down to the incoming of the scientific studies of the present day.

299. It aided the Development of the Vernacular Literatures. — The classical revival gave to the world the treasures of two great literatures. And in giving to the scholars of Europe the masterpieces of the ancient authors, it gave to them, besides much fresh material, the most faultless models of literary taste and judgment that the world has ever produced. The influence of these in correcting the extravagances of the mediæval imagination and in creating correct literary ideals can be distinctly traced in the native literatures of Italy, France, Spain, and England.

It is sometimes maintained indeed that the attention given to the ancient classics, and the preferred use by so many authors during the later mediæval and the earlier modern period of the Latin as a literary language,[16] retarded the normal development of the vernacular literatures of the European peoples. As to Italy, it is true that the national literature which had started into life with such promise with Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio was for almost a century neglected; but in transalpine Europe, apart from Germany, where for a period Latin did almost supplant the vernacular, the revived study of the classics did not produce the disastrous effects observed in Italy. On the contrary, as we have just said, the effect of humanism upon the great literatures of Europe, aside from the exceptions noticed, was to enrich, to chasten, and to refine them.

300. It called into Existence the Sciences of Archæology and Historical Criticism. — Many sciences were in germ in the Renaissance. As to the science of archæology, which possesses such a special interest for the historical student, it may be truly said that it had its birth in the classical revival. We have already noticed the new feeling for the remains of antiquity that stirred in the souls of the men of the Renaissance (sec. 282).

The ruins of Rome were naturally the first object of the reverent curiosity and archæological zeal of the Italian scholars. From the fifteenth century down to the present day the interest in the monuments and relics of past ages and civilization has steadily

[16] Some of the very best literary work of the period was done in Latin, as witness the *Colloquies* by Erasmus and the *Utopia* by More.

widened and deepened and has led to remarkable discoveries, not only on classical ground, but also in Hebrew, Assyrian, and Egyptian territories, — discoveries which, by carrying the story of the human race back into a past immensely remote, have given an entirely new beginning to history.

What is true of the science of archæology is equally true of the science of historical criticism. We have seen that the spirit which awoke in the Renaissance was a questioning, critical spirit, one very different from the credulous mediæval spirit, which was ready to accept any picturesque tradition or marvelous tale without inquiry as to its source or credibility. It was this spirit that stirred in Petrarch. We find him comparing and criticising the classical authors and following only those whom he has reason to believe to be trustworthy.

But the true founder of the science of historical criticism was Laurentius Valla (1407–1457). His greatest achievement as a critic was the demonstration, on philological and historical grounds, of the unauthentic character of the celebrated Donation of Constantine.[17] He also called in question the authority of Livy and proved the spurious character of the alleged correspondence between Seneca and the Apostle Paul.

The achievements of Valla ushered in the day of historical criticism. Here began that critical sifting and valuation of our historical sources which has resulted in the discrediting of a thousand myths and legends once regarded as unimpeachable historical material, and in the consequent reconstruction of Oriental, classical, and mediæval history.

301. It gave an Impulse to Religious Reform. — The humanistic movement, as we have already noticed, when it crossed the Alps assumed among the northern peoples a new character. It was the Hebrew past rather than the Græco-Roman past which stirred the interest of the scholars of the North. The Bible, which the printing presses were now multiplying in the original Hebrew and Greek as well as in the vernacular languages, became the subject of enthusiastic study and of fresh interpretation. Consequently

[17] See sec. 41, n. 15.

what was in the South a restoration of classical literature and art became in the more serious and less sensuous North a revival of primitive Christianity, of the ethical and religious elements of the Hebrew-Christian past. The humanist became the reformer. Reuchlin, Erasmus, and the other humanists of the North were the true precursors of the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century.

Selections from the Sources. — ROBINSON and ROLFE, *Petrarch.* This volume contains a selection from Petrarch's "correspondence with Boccaccio and other friends, designed to illustrate the beginnings of the Renaissance." The student should begin his readings on this subject with this delightful book. WHITCOMB, *Source-Book of the Renaissance*, Part I. An excellent little book, which forms a good supplement to the preceding work. The part cited contains short extracts judiciously chosen from the writings of fourteen Italian writers of the age of the Renaissance. *The Book of The Courtier* (The Tudor Translations). This book is one of the most important and characteristic products of the Italian Renaissance. It was translated into all the chief European languages and exerted a vast influence upon life and manners everywhere, and especially in England. "There is not the slightest reason for doubting," says Professor Saintsbury, "that Sidney himself had the *Courtier* and its ideal constantly before him." ROBINSON, *Readings in European History*, vol. i, chap. xxii.

Secondary Works. — The literature on the Renaissance is very extensive; we shall suggest only a few titles. SYMONDS, *The Renaissance in Italy;* the best extended history in English. BURCKHARDT, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy;* the most philosophical and suggestive work on the subject. MRS. OLIPHANT, *Makers of Florence* and *Makers of Venice.* FIELD, *An Introduction to the Study of the Renaissance.* ADAMS, *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. xv. MUNRO and SELLERY, *Mediæval Civilization*, pp. 277–309. PUTNAM, *Books and their Makers during the Middle Ages*, vol. i, Part II, "The Earlier Printed Books." GRIMM, *The Life of Michael Angelo.* ARMSTRONG, *Lorenzo de' Medici and Florence in the Fifteenth Century.*

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Dante's life and his *Divine Comedy.* 2. The ruins of Rome in mediæval times. 3. Petrarch's ascent of Mount Ventoux. 4. Boccaccio as a collector of ancient manuscripts. 5. Chrysoloras, the Greek teacher. 6. The Aldine Press.

Part II—The Modern Age

THIRD PERIOD—THE ERA OF THE REFORMATION

(From the Discovery of America, in 1492, to the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648)

CHAPTER XIX

GEOGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES AND THE BEGINNINGS OF MODERN COLONIZATION

302. **Transition from the Mediæval to the Modern Age.** — The discovery of America by Columbus, in 1492, is often used to mark the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of modern times; and this was an event of such transcendent importance, — the effect upon civilization of the opening up of fresh continents was so great, — that we may very properly accord to the achievement of the Genoese the honor proposed. Yet we must bear in mind that no single circumstance or event actually marks the end of the old order of things and the beginning of the new. The finding of the New World did not make the new age; the new age discovered the New World. The undertaking of Columbus was the natural outcome of that spirit of commercial enterprise and scientific curiosity which for centuries — ever since the Crusades — had been gradually expanding the scope of mercantile adventure and broadening the horizon of the European world. His fortunate expedition was only one of several brilliant nautical exploits which distinguished the close of the fifteenth and the opening of the sixteenth century.

This same period was also marked by significant intellectual, political, and religious movements, which indicated that civilization was about to enter — indeed, had already entered — upon a new phase of its development.

In the intellectual world, as we have seen, was going on the wonderful Revival of Learning, producing everywhere unwonted thought, stir, and enterprise.[1] This intellectual movement alone would suffice to mark the period of which we speak as the beginning of a new historical era; for the opening and the closing of the great epochs of history, such as the Age of Christianity, the Age of the Protestant Reformation, and the Age of the Political Revolution, are determined not by events or happenings in the outer world but by movements within the soul of humanity.

In the political world the tendency to centralization which had long been at work in different countries of Europe, gathering up the little feudal units into larger aggregates, was culminating in the formation of great independent nations with strong monarchical governments. The Age of the Nations was opening. This movement was one of vast significance in European history and might in itself very well be regarded as forming a division line between two great epochs.

In the religious world there were unrest, dissatisfaction, inquiry, complaint, — premonitory symptoms of the tremendous revolution that was destined to render the sixteenth century memorable in the religious records of mankind. This upheaval also constitutes a sort of continental divide in history.

1 The truest representative of the intellectual revival on its scientific side was Nicholas Copernicus (1473–1543), who, while Columbus and others were exploring the earth's unknown seas and opening up a new hemisphere for civilization, was exploring the heavens and discovering the true system of the universe. He had quite fully matured his theory by the year 1507, but fearing the charge of heresy he did not publish the great work embodying his views until thirty-six years later (in 1543). It should be carefully noted, however, that the Copernican theory had little influence on the thought of the sixteenth century. It was denounced as contrary to Scripture by both Catholics and Protestants, and was almost universally rejected for more than a hundred years after its first publication. Even after the revelations made by the telescope of Galileo (1564–1642) the acceptance of the truth was so hindered by theological opposition that the complete triumph of the doctrine was delayed until the eighteenth century. See Andrew D. White, *The Warfare of Science with Theology*, vol. i, chap. iii.

Closely connected with these movements were three great inventions which, like the inventions of our own time (sec. 760), were also signs of a new age, and which powerfully helped on the mental and social revolutions. Thus the intellectual revival and the religious reform were greatly promoted by the new art of printing (sec. 289); the kings in their struggle with the nobles were materially aided by the use of gunpowder, which rendered useless costly armor and fortified castle and helped to replace the feudal levy by a regular standing army, the prop and bulwark of the royal power; while the great ocean voyages of the times were rendered possible only by the improvement of the mariner's compass,[2] whose trusty guidance emboldened the navigator to quit the shore and push out upon hitherto untraversed seas.



FIG. 53. — A CHINESE MAGNET FIGURE (After *Beazley*)

A rude form of the compass used by early Chinese sailors.[2] The little wooden figure was set on a pivot, and in the outstretched arm was placed a bar of magnetized iron

303. Maritime Explorations; the Terrors of the Ocean. — To appreciate the greatness of the achievements of the navigators and explorers of the age of geographical discovery, we need to bear in mind with what terrors the mediæval imagination had invested the unknown regions of the earth. In the popular conception these parts were haunted by demons and dragons and monsters of every kind. The lands were shrouded in eternal mists and darkness. The seas were filled with awful whirlpools and treacherous currents, and shallowed into vast marshes. Out in the Atlantic, so a popular superstition taught, was the mouth of hell; the red glow cast upon the sun at its setting was held to be positive evidence of this. Away to the south, under the

[2] It is a disputed question as to what people should be given the credit of the discovery of the properties of the magnetic needle. In a very primitive form the compass was certainly in use among the Chinese as early as the eighth century of our era. There is no reliable record of its use by European navigators before about the middle of the thirteenth century. It seems most probable that a knowledge of the instrument was gained in the East by the crusaders.

equator, there was believed to be an impassable belt of fire. This was a very persistent idea, and was not dispelled until men had actually sailed beyond the equatorial regions.

304. **Portuguese Explorations; Prince Henry the Navigator.** — Many incentives concurred to urge daring navigators in the later mediæval time to undertake voyages of discovery, but a chief motive was a desire to find a water way that should serve as a new trade route between Europe and the Indies.

The first attempts to reach these lands by an all sea route were made by sailors feeling their way down the western coast of the African continent. The favorable situation of Portugal upon the Atlantic seaboard caused her to become foremost in these enterprises. Throughout the fifteenth century Portuguese sailors were year after year penetrating a little farther into the mysterious tropical seas and uncovering new reaches of the western coast of Africa. The soul and inspiration of all this maritime enterprise was Prince Henry the Navigator (1394–1460).

In the year 1442 the Portuguese mariners reached the Gulf of Guinea, and here discovered the home of the true negro. Some of the ebony-skinned natives were carried to Portugal as slaves. This was the beginning of the modern African slave trade, which was destined to shape such large sections of the history of the centuries with which we have to do. The traffic was at first approved by even the most philanthropic persons, on the ground that the certain conversion of the slaves under Christian masters would more than compensate them for their loss of freedom.

Finally, in 1486, Bartholomew Dias succeeded in reaching the most southern point of the continent, which, as the possibility of reaching India by sea now seemed assured, was later given the name of Cape of Good Hope. But at the same time it was a disappointment to the Portuguese to find that Africa extended so far to the south. Even should India be reached, the way, it was now known, would be long and dangerous. This knowledge stimulated efforts to reach the Indies and the "place of spices" by a different and shorter route.

305. Columbus in Search of a Westward Route to the Indies finds the New World (1492). — It was Christopher Columbus, a Genoese by birth, who now proposed the bold plan of reaching these eastern lands by sailing westward. The sphericity of the earth was a doctrine held by all the really learned men of this time. This notion was also familiar to many at least of the common people; but they, while vaguely accepting the view that the earth is round, thought that the habitable part was a comparatively flat, shieldlike plain on the top of it. All the rest they thought to be covered by the waters of a great ocean.

FIG. 54. — CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS. (After the Capriolo portrait; from the *Columbus Memorial Volume*)

While agreed as to the globular form of the earth and of the curvature of the land as well as of the water surface, scholars differed as to the proportion of land and water. The common opinion among them was that the greater part of the earth's surface was water. Some, however, believed that three fourths or more of its surface was land, and that only a narrow ocean separated the western shores of Europe from the eastern shores of Asia. Columbus held this latter view, and also shared with others a misconception as to the size of the earth, supposing it to be much smaller than it really is. Consequently he felt sure that a westward sail of three or four thousand miles would bring him to the Indies. Thus his very misconceptions fed his hopes and drew him on to his great discovery.

Everybody knows how Columbus in his endeavors to secure a patron for his enterprise met at first with repeated repulse and disappointment; how at last he gained the ear of Queen Isabella of Castile; how a fleet of three small vessels was fitted out for the explorer; and how the New World was discovered, — or rather rediscovered (sec. 83).

The return of Columbus to Spain with his vessels loaded with the strange animal and vegetable products of the new lands he had found, together with several specimens of the inhabitants, — a race of men new to Europeans, — produced the profoundest sensation among all classes. Curiosity was unbounded. The spirit of hazardous enterprise awakened by the surprising discovery led to those subsequent undertakings by Castilian adventurers which make up the most thrilling pages of Spanish history.

Columbus made altogether four voyages to the new lands; still he died in ignorance of the fact that he had really discovered a new world. He supposed the land he had found to be some part of the Indies, whence the name "West Indies" which still clings to the islands between North and South America, and the term "Indians" applied to the aborigines. It was not until the middle of the sixteenth century that it became fully established that a great new double continent, separated from Asia by an ocean wider than the Atlantic, had been found.

Columbus never received during his lifetime a fitting recognition of the unparalleled service he had rendered Spain and the world. Jealousy pursued him, and from his third voyage he was sent home loaded with chains. Even the continent he had discovered, instead of being called after him as a perpetual memorial, was named from a Florentine navigator, Amerigo Vespucci, whose chief claim to this distinction was his having written the first widely published account of the new lands.

306. The Voyage of Vasco da Gama (1497–1498); the Portuguese create a Colonial Empire in the East. — We have seen that by the year 1486 the Portuguese navigators, in their search for an ocean route to the Indies, had reached the southern point of Africa. A little later, six years after the first voyage of Columbus,

GLOBE DE MARTIN BEHAIM, 1492
ARCTIC CIRCLE
ICELAND
IRELAND
TARTARY
CATHAY
MANGI
INDIA
Canton
Zaitan
AZORES
PORTUGAL
Lisbon
CANARIES
TROPIC OF ♋ CANCER
CIPANGU
CAPE VERDE IS.
Cape Verde
ST. BRANDAN'S IS.
GUINEA
LIBYA
SERRA LION
JAVA MAJOR
TROPIC OF CAPRICORN
JAVA MINOR
0
20
40
60
80

GLOBE DORÉ VERS 1528
ARCTIC CIRCLE
ICELAND
IRELAND
PORTUGAL
CATHAY
FLORIDA
NEW SPAIN
CUBA
MANGI
TROPIC OF CANCER
CANARIES
DOMINICA
DARIEN
GUINEA
SERRA LION
EQUATOR
210
240
270
300
330
360
15
AMERICA
BRAZIL
TROPIC OF CAPRICORN
Sea of Magellan
Str. of Magellan
20
40
60
80

Vasco da Gama, a Portuguese admiral, doubled the Cape, crossed the Indian Ocean, and landed on the coast of Malabar.

The discovery of an unbroken water path to India effected most important changes in the trade routes and traffic of the world. It made the port of Lisbon the depot of the Eastern trade. The merchants of Venice were ruined. The great warehouses of Alexandria were left empty. The old route to the Indies by way of the Red Sea, which had been from time immemorial a main line of communication between the Far East and the Mediterranean lands, now fell into disuse, not to be reopened until the construction of the Suez Canal in our own day.

Portugal dotted the coasts of Africa and Asia, the Moluccas and other islands of the Pacific archipelago, with fortresses and factories, and built up in these parts a great commercial empire, and, through the extraordinary impulse thus given to the enterprise and ambition of her citizens, now entered upon the most splendid era of her history.[3]

307. The Papal Line of Demarcation. — Remarkable and bold as were the voyages of Columbus and Vasco da Gama, these were now to be eclipsed by the still more adventurous enterprise of the circumnavigation of the globe by Ferdinand Magellan, a navigator of Portuguese birth. But to make intelligible the object of this expedition there is needed a word of explanation concerning what is known as the Papal Line of Demarcation.

Upon the return of Columbus from his successful expedition, Pope Alexander VI, with a view to adjusting the conflicting claims of Spain and Portugal, issued a bull wherein he drew from pole to pole a line of demarcation through the Atlantic one hundred leagues west of the Azores[4] (the line was afterwards moved two hundred and seventy leagues westward[5]), and awarded

[3] Among the makers of the Portuguese colonial empire Albuquerque (1452?–1515) stands preëminent. The story of his career possesses many elements of romance.

[4] As it was impossible for the surveyors and geometers to fix upon the right starting point, the indefiniteness of the language of the bull made no end of trouble. See Bourne's *Essays in Historical Criticism*, Essay vii.

[5] One result of this change was to throw the eastward projecting part of South America to the east of the demarcation line, and thus to make it a Portuguese instead of a Spanish possession.

to the Spanish sovereigns all pagan lands, not already in possession of Christian princes, that their subjects might find west of this line, and to the Portuguese kings all unclaimed pagan lands discovered by Portuguese navigators east of the designated meridian.[6] By treaty arrangements as well as by papal edicts, — which were based on the theory of that time that the ocean like the land might be appropriated by any power and absolute control over it asserted,[7] — the Portuguese were prohibited from sailing any of the seas thus placed under the dominion of Spain or from visiting as traders any of her lands, and the Spaniards from trespassing upon the waters or the lands granted to the Portuguese.

Spain was thus shut out from the use of the Cape route to the Indies which had been opened up by Vasco da Gama, and consequently from participation in the coveted spice trade, unless perchance a way to the region of spices could be found through some opening in the new lands discovered by Columbus.

308. The Circumnavigation of the Globe by Magellan (1519–1522). — Such was the situation of things when Magellan laid before the young Emperor Charles V, grandson of the Isabella who had given Columbus his commission, his plan of reaching the Moluccas, or "Spice Islands," which he contended were in Spanish waters,[8] by a westward voyage. The young king looked with favor upon the navigator's plans, and placed under his command a fleet of five small vessels.

Magellan directed his ships in a southwesterly course across the Atlantic, hoping to find towards the south a break in the newfound lands. Near the most southern point of South America he

[6] The claim of the popes to the right thus to dispose of pagan lands was believed to be supported by such Scripture texts as this: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession" (Psalms ii. 8). Spain and Portugal recognized this claim, but the Catholic sovereigns in general only in so far as it coincided with their interests to do so. After the Lutheran revolt the rulers of the Protestant states gave no heed to it.

[7] Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), the eminent Dutch jurist, in a treatise entitled *Mare Liberum*, refuted this theory, and in opposition to it maintained that the ocean should be free to all, — a far-reaching doctrine which finally became a part of the common law of nations.

[8] There was difficulty in determining just where among the islands lying southeast of Asia the papal line of demarcation, when carried around the globe, should run.

found the narrow strait that now bears his name. Through this channel the bold sailor pushed his vessels and found himself upon a great sea with a blank horizon to the west. From the calm, unruffled face of the new ocean, so different from the stormy Atlantic, he gave to it the name *Pacific*.

The voyage of these first intruders[9] from the Old World upon the unknown sea, beneath the strange constellations of the southern skies, was one of almost incredible sufferings, endured with the bravest fortitude. Finally, on March 16, 1521, Magellan reached the group of islands now known as the Philippines, having been so named in honor of Philip II, Charles' son and his successor on the Spanish throne. On one of these islands Magellan was killed in a fight with the natives.

The year following the discovery of the Philippines a single battered ship of the fleet, the *Victoria*, with eighteen men out of the original crews of over two hundred sailors, entered the Spanish port of Seville. The globe had for the first time been circumnavigated. The most adventurous enterprise of which record has been preserved had been successfully accomplished. "In the whole history of human undertakings," says Draper, "there is nothing that exceeds, if, indeed, there is anything that equals, this voyage of Magellan's. That of Columbus dwindles away in comparison."

Equally does the exploit seem to have impressed the imagination of Magellan's own age. The old writer Richard Eden (b. about 1521) refers to it as "a thing doubtless so strange and marvelous that, as the like was never done before, so is it perhaps never like to be done again; so far have the navigations of the Spaniards excelled the voyage of Jason and the Argonauts to the region of Colchis, or all that ever were before"; and a Spanish contemporary declares, "Nothing more notable in navigation has ever been heard of since the voyage of the patriarch Noah."

The results of the achievement were greater in the intellectual realm than in the commercial or the political domain. It revolutionized whole systems of mediæval theory and belief; it pushed aside old narrow geographical ideas; it settled forever and for all

[9] The Pacific had several years before this been seen at the Isthmus of Darien.

men the question as to the shape and size of the earth. It brought to an end the scholastic controversy concerning the antipodes, — that is, whether there were men living on the "under" side of the earth. The state of most men's minds in regard to this matter had till then been just about the same as is ours to-day on the question whether or not the planets are inhabited.



FIG. 55. — "THE ANTIPODES IN DERISION." (From Cosmas, *Christian Topography;* after Beazley, *The Dawn of Modern Geography*)

Cosmas lived in the sixth Christian century. In the cut here reproduced from his *Topography*, he ridicules the idea of a round earth with people on the under side whose heads hang downwards. The views of Cosmas as to the existence of an antipodal people had defenders throughout the mediæval centuries

309. These Voyages and Geographical Discoveries ushered in a New Epoch. — By some geographers civilization is conceived as having passed through three stages, — the potamic or river stage, the thalassic or inland sea stage, and the oceanic stage. In the case of our own civilization, whose beginnings we seek in Egypt and Babylonia, these steps or stages seem fairly well defined and mark off historical times into three great periods, which may be named the River Epoch, the Sea Epoch, and the Ocean Epoch.

The River Epoch was that during which civilization was confined to river valleys, like those of the Nile, the Tigris, and the Euphrates. The chief cities of this period, as, for instance, Memphis and Thebes in Egypt, Nineveh and Babylon in Mesopotamia, arose on the banks of great streams. Rivers were the pathways of commerce. Boats were small and the art of sea navigation was practically unknown.

The Sea Epoch was that during which the Mediterranean was the theater of civilization. It was ushered in by the Phœnicians,

the first skillful sea navigators, in the second millennium before our era. From the river banks the seats of trade and population were transferred to the shores of the Mediterranean, and Tyre and Sidon and Carthage and Ephesus and Miletus and Byzantium and Corinth and Athens and Rome arose and played their parts in the transactions of the thalassic age. So entirely did the events of this age center in and about the Mediterranean that this sea has been aptly called the Forum of the ancient world.

The Ocean Epoch was opened up by the voyages and geographical discoveries of which we have just been speaking. In this period the great oceans have ceased to be barriers between the nations, and have become instead the natural highways of the world's intercourse and commerce.[10]

310. The Five Early Colonial Empires. — One of the most important phases of the earlier history of this Ocean Epoch was the expansion of the five states on the Atlantic seaboard of Europe — namely, Portugal, Spain, France, the Netherlands, and England — each into a great empire, embracing colonies and dependencies in two hemispheres. This expansion of Europe into Greater Europe holds somewhat such a place in modern history as the expansion of Hellas into Greater Hellas and of Rome into Greater Rome holds in ancient history.

In the mutual jealousies and the conflicting interests of these growing colonial empires is to be found the ground and cause of many of the great wars of modern times since the close of the religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For this reason, although it is our special task to trace the lines of the historic development in Europe, we shall from time to time call the reader's attention to these European interests outside of the European continent. In the present connection a few words in regard to Spanish conquests and the beginnings of Spanish colonization in the New World will suffice.

311. The Conquest of Mexico (1519–1521). — The accounts of Spanish explorations and conquests in the lands opened up

[10] The Ocean Epoch may be conceived as embracing two periods,— the Atlantic and the Pacific period. The latter is just opening. See Chapter XLIII on the expansion of Europe.

by the fortunate voyage of Columbus read more like a romance than any other chapter in history. They tell of men growing old while hunting through strange lands for the Fountain of Youth; of expeditions lost for years to the knowledge of men, while searching beneath gloomy forests for El Dorado; of explorations upon seas and amidst mountains never before looked upon by men of the Old World; of voyages on ocean-like rivers which led no one knew where; and of ancient states conquered and their enormous accumulations of gold and silver seized by a few score of adventurous knights.[11]

Perhaps the most brilliant exploit in which the Spanish cavaliers engaged during this period of daring and romantic adventure was the conquest of Mexico. Reports of a rich and powerful "Empire" upon the mainland to the west were constantly spread among the Spanish colonists who very soon after the discovery of the New World settled the islands in the Gulf of Mexico. These stories inflamed the imagination of adventurous spirits among the settlers, and an expedition, consisting of five or six hundred foot soldiers and sixteen horsemen, was organized and placed under the command of Hernando Cortes for the conquest and "conversion" of the heathen nation. The expedition was successful, and soon the Spaniards were masters of the greater part of what now constitutes the republic of Mexico.

The state that the conquerors destroyed was not an empire, as termed by the contemporary Spanish chroniclers, but rather a sort of league or confederacy — something like the Iroquois confederacy in the North — formed of three Indian tribes.[12] Of these the Aztecs were the leading tribe and gave name to the confederacy. At the head of the league stood a sachem, or war-chief, who bore the name of Montezuma.

[11] Juan Ponce de Leon started on his romantic expedition in search of the fabled spring in 1512; Vasco de Balboa discovered the Pacific in 1513; Hernando de Soto, while searching for a rich Indian kingdom, found the Mississippi in 1541; and in the same year Francisco de Orellana descended the eastern slope of the Andes to the Napo, floated down that stream to the Amazon, and then drifted on down to the sea.

[12] Prescott's description of the Mexican state, especially as to its political organization, is misleading. For later authorities see bibliography at end of the chapter.

Greenland
Iceland
LABRADOR
Discovered 1610
Hudson Bay Co.
Rupert's Land
CANADA OR NEW FRANCE
Quebec
ACADIA OR NEW SCOTLAND 1605
NEW FOUNDLAND
Cortereal 1500
Cabot's 1st Voyage 1497
Placentia
Port Royal 1604
Boston 1602
NEW ENGLAND 1620
NEW YORK 1609
NEW NETHERLAND 1614
Cabot 1498
Cortereal 1501
SCOTLAND
IRELAND
ENGLAND
PORTUGAL
Oporto
Lisbon
Sagres
Azores 1450
Madeira 1418
Canary Is. 1479
C. Nun
C. Bojador 1433
C. Blanco
Cape Verde Is. 1460
Verde
Gambia R.
Fort James
Cape Coast Castle
Santa Fé (1598)
Discovered by Coronado
Charlestown
Discovered by De Soto 1539-42
St. Augustine 1565
FLORIDA
Discovered by Ponce de Leon 1513
C. Hatteras
Bermudas 1609-12
CALIFORNIA
MEXICO (NEW SPAIN)
La Salle's Settlement 1684
Bahama Is.
Columbus 1st Voyage 1492-93
S. Cruz Bay 1536
1519
YUCATAN
CUBA
S. Salvador
Hispaniola
Porto Rico
Guadeloupe
Martinique
Mexico
Vera Cruz
Guatemala
HONDURAS
NICARAGUA
Jamaica (Brit. after 1655)
Curaçoa
Venezuela
Caracas
Portobello
Trinidad
Columbus 3rd Voyage 1498-1500
Magellan 1519
Span. Main
TERRA FIRMA
Truxillo
Bogota
Orin
GUIANA
PORTUGUESE GUIANA
Amazon R.
Pizon 1500
Discovered 1513 by Vasco Nunez
PANAMA
South Sea (Pacific)
NEW GRENADA 1550
Equator
Quito
Guayaquil
Para
DUTCH 1633-54
Recife or Pernambuco
S. Salvador or Bahia 1549, 1624-6
BRAZIL
BAHIA
Truxillo
Lima
Callao
Cuzco
EMPIRE OF THE INCAS
Potosi
Paraguay R.
Jesuit Missions 1600
Cabral 1500
Asuncion
Rio de Janeiro
Magellan
Coquimbo
Santiago
Cordova
La Plata
Buenos Ayres
Rio de la Plata (Disc. by De Solis 1516)
Concepcion
Lago 1535
CHILI
PATAGONIA
Disco 1535
Straits of Magellan
Terra del Fuego
PAPAL LINE OF DEMARCATION (SPANISH CLAIM 1527)
Scale o
100
80
60
40
20
Longitude West from Greenwich


20
40
60
80
100
120
NORWAY
NETHERLANDS
60
40
20
Bassorah
Ormuz
Muscat
Diu 1536
Ft. William 1690
Surat 1612
Bombay 1661
Goa 1510
Cannanore 1512
Calicut 1656
Madras 1639 (Ft. St. George)
Pondicherry 1672
Ceylon
Colombo 1517
Coromandel
Malabar
Massowa
Aden
C. Guardafui
Pt. de Galle
Vasco da Gama 1498
TONG KING
Macao
Formosa
Philippines 1521
Magellan died
Mindanao
Junk
Malacca 1511
Sumatra
Borneo
Celebes
Java
Moluccas
Conquered by Dutch 1602-20
Equator
Mombasa
Melinda
Zanzibar
C. Delgado
Mozambique 1508
KINGDOM OF MONOMOTAPA
Mauritius 1598
Magellan's Companions
Tropic of Capricorn
Delagoa Bay
Madagascar
Gama 1497
Vasco 1498
B. Diaz 1487
1651
C. of Storms
C. of Good Hope
R. Congo
SLAVE
LABOR
C. Negro
EXPLORATIONS AND COLONIES
OF THE 15TH, 16TH, AND 17TH CENTURIES
BRITISH
FRENCH
DANISH
SPANISH
PORTUGUESE
DUTCH
British and French Rival Claims
M. N. WORKS, BUFFALO
2000
3000
es along the Equator
20
Longitude 40 East from 60 Greenwich 80
100
120
60
40
20

The Aztecs, at the time of the discovery of America, had reached what is called the "middle stage of barbarism," — a stage of culture which the Mediterranean races had reached and passed probably two thousand years before Christ. They employed a system of picture-writing. Their religion was a sort of sun worship. They were cannibals and offered human victims in their sacrifices. They had no knowledge of the horse or the ox, or of any other useful domesticated animal except the dog.[13] They cultivated maize, but were without wheat, oats, or barley. They held their lands in common, and lived in communal or joint-tenement houses, which were large enough to accommodate from ten to one hundred families. It was these immense structures which the Spanish writers described as "palaces" and "public edifices." These buildings were, doubtless, the same in plan as those to be seen at the present day among the Pueblo Indians of the southwestern part of the United States.

312. **The Conquest of Peru** (1532–1536). — Shortly after the conquest of the Indians of Mexico the subjugation of the Indians of Peru was effected. The civilization of the Peruvians was superior to that of the Mexicans. It has been compared, as to several of its elements, to that of ancient Assyria. Not only were the great cities of the empire filled with splendid temples and palaces, but throughout the country were to be seen magnificent works of public utility, such as roads, bridges, and aqueducts. The government of the Incas, the royal or ruling race, was a mild, paternal autocracy.

Glowing reports of the enormous wealth of the Incas, the commonest articles in whose palaces, it was asserted, were of solid gold, reached the Spaniards by way of the Isthmus of Darien, and it was not long before an expedition, consisting

[13] It has been conjectured that the backwardness in civilization of the native races of the Americas is to be attributed in part to their lack of useful tame animals. See Fiske, *The Discovery of America*, vol. i, p. 27. The native fauna of the New World as compared with that of the Old is singularly poor in tamable species. Aside from the llama, the alpaca, and the turkey, the New World has contributed nothing of essential value to the great store of domesticated stocks which constitute the basis of so large a part of modern industry.

of less than two hundred men, was organized for the conquest of the country. The leader of the band was Francisco Pizarro, an iron-hearted, cruel, and illiterate adventurer.

Through treachery Pizarro made a prisoner of the Inca, Atahualpa. The captive offered, as a ransom for his release, to fill the room in which he was confined "as high as he could reach" with vessels of gold. Pizarro accepted the offer, and the palaces and temples throughout the empire were stripped of their golden vessels, and the apartment was filled with the precious relics. The value of the treasure is estimated at over $15,000,000. When this vast wealth was once under the control of the Spaniards, they seized it all, and then treacherously put the Inca to death (1533). With the death of Atahualpa the power of the Inca dynasty passed away forever.

313. Beginnings of Spanish Colonization in the New World. — Not until more than one hundred years after the discovery of the Western Hemisphere by Columbus was there established a single permanent English settlement within the limits of what is now the United States; but into those parts of the new lands opened up by Spanish exploration and conquest there began to pour at once a tremendous stream of Spanish adventurers and colonists in search of fortune and fame. Upon the West India Islands, in Mexico, in Central America, all along the Pacific slope of the Andes, and everywhere upon the lofty and pleasant table-lands that had formed the heart of the empire of the Incas, there sprang up rapidly cities as centers of mining and agricultural industries, of commerce and of trade. Often, as in the case of Mexico, Quito, and Cuzco, these new cities were simply the renovated and rebuilt towns of the conquered natives.

Thus did a Greater Spain grow up in the New World. Before the close of the sixteenth century the dominions of the Spanish monarch in the new lands formed of themselves a magnificent empire, and were the source, chiefly through the wealth of their gold and silver mines, of a large revenue to the royal exchequer. It was, in part, the treasures derived from these new possessions that enabled the sovereigns of Spain to play the important part

they did in the affairs of Europe during the century following the discovery of America.[14]

Having thus indicated one source of Spanish greatness and reputation, it will be one of our aims in a following chapter to give some idea of the way in which this power and prestige were used by the Spanish sovereigns in maintaining the supremacy of the Catholic Church in the interests of Spain.

Suggestion to Teachers — Comparative Study

In no way, we think, will the teacher be able to give his pupils so clear an idea of the character of the sixteenth century as by having them make a comparative study of that century and the nineteenth. The striking parallels which they will discover between the two periods will be sure to suggest to them that "the wonderful nineteenth century," as it is called by Alfred Russel Wallace, like the sixteenth, may be a transition period, a period which will be regarded by the future historian as we regard the sixteenth, — as the beginning of a new age in history. Having gained this viewpoint, they will see all the events, movements, and enterprises of the earlier period under

[14] After having robbed the Indians of their wealth in gold and silver, the slow accumulations of centuries, the Spaniards further enriched themselves by the enforced labor of the unfortunate natives. Unused to such toil as was exacted of them under the lash of worse than Egyptian taskmasters, the Indians wasted away by millions in the mines of Mexico and Peru, and upon the sugar plantations of the West Indies. More than half of the native population of Peru is thought to have been consumed in the Peruvian mines. "During fifty years," says a recent writer, "the Spaniards uniformly conquered and enslaved [the natives]; put them to forced labour, to which they were physically unequal; and on the least resistance or other provocation, massacred them in great numbers. One estimate says that in these years 40,000,000 of the native Americans perished by violence: the lowest makes the number 10,000,000; and it is to be feared the former is nearer the truth. It is certain that the islands of the West Indies once contained nearly 6,000,000 of a race now quite extinct; and that in Hayti alone they sank, in fifteen years, from 1,000,000 to 60,000, and, in fifty years, to 200" (Payne, *European Colonies*, pp. 89, 90). As a substitute for native labor, negroes were introduced. This was the beginning of the African slave trade in the New World. At the outset the traffic was approved by a benevolent bishop named Las Casas (1474–1566), known as the "Apostle of the Indians." Before his death, however, Las Casas came to recognize the wickedness of negro as well as of Indian slavery, and to regret that he had ever expressed approval of the plan of substituting one for the other. See Fiske, *The Discovery of America*, vol. ii, pp. 454–458.

a familiar light. The following will suggest in what realms parallels may be sought:

The Sixteenth Century	The Nineteenth Century
a. The New Learning. Great intellectual activity.	*a.* The New Sciences. Great intellectual activity.
b. The Reformation. Revision of creeds. Relation of the religious movement to the Renaissance.	*b.* The New Theology. Revision of creeds. Relation of this movement to the birth of the new scientific spirit.
c. The unification of great nations, — England, France, Spain.	*c.* The unification of great nations, — Germany, Italy.
d. The expansion of Europe; the partition of the New World and of Southern Asia. The formation of colonial empires, — Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, French, and English.	*d.* The expansion of Europe; the partition of Africa and of Oceania. The formation of new colonial empires, — English, French, German, Belgian, and American.
e. Great geographical and astronomical discoveries (Columbus, Copernicus), which reveal the universe as infinite in *space*. Man's conceptions concerning the earth and its place in the universe revolutionized.	*e.* Great geological and biological discoveries (*Evolution* — Lyell, Darwin), which reveal the universe as infinite in *time*. Man's conceptions as to his origin and his place in the plan of creation revolutionized.
f. Great inventions, now first hit upon or brought into general use, — printing, gunpowder, and the mariner's compass. Political, social, and economic revolutions caused or promoted by them.	*f.* Great inventions, — the steam railway, the ocean steamship, the electric telegraph, electric motor, etc. Political, social, and economic revolutions caused or furthered by their introduction.

Selections from the Sources. — *Cathay and the Way Thither* (ed. by Colonel Yule). The student here learns with what knowledge of Eastern Asia Columbus and the others set out, and what they expected to find. *The Journal of Christopher Columbus* (Hakluyt Society publications). *Old South Leaflets*, Nos. 29, 31–36, 39, 71, 89, 90, 102. *The First Three English Books on America* (ed. by Edward Arber). This work possesses a special fascination. "One is able therein," as says the editor, "to look out on the New World as its discoverers and first explorers looked upon it."

Secondary Works. — Keane, *The Evolution of Geography*, chaps. v–viii. Beazley, *Prince Henry the Navigator*. There are numerous lives of Columbus: Winsor's, Irving's, C. K. Adams', and Markham's can be recommended. Guillemard, *The Life of Ferdinand Magellan*. Fiske, *The Discovery of America*. There is not a chapter here that will fail to interest

and charm young readers. *The Cambridge Modern History*, vol. i, chap. i, "The Age of Discovery"; and chap. ii, "The New World." BOURNE, *Essays in Historical Criticism*, Essay No. 6, "Prince Henry the Navigator," and Essay No. 7, "The Demarcation Line of Pope Alexander VI." PRESCOTT, *Conquest of Mexico* and *Conquest of Peru;* should be read in connection with later works. STEPHENS, *Albuquerque*. PAYNE, *History of the New World called America*, vol. i, pp. 303–364; for the relation of the aboriginal civilizations of the Americas to their animal and plant life.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Copernicus and the slow acceptance of his theory. See A. D. White, *A History of the Warfare of Science and Theology*, vol. i, chap. iii. 2. Prince Henry the Navigator. 3. The legend of Prester John. 4. The Naming of America. See article by Professor E. G. Bourne, in *The American Historical Review* for October, 1904. 5. Civilization of the Aztecs. 6. Civilization of the Peruvians.

CHAPTER XX

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE REFORMATION

314. Introductory Statement. — When the Modern Age opened the European peoples were on the eve of a great religious revolution. This was a dual movement. It was an insurrection against the Papacy, resulting in the severance by half the nations of Europe of the bonds which throughout the mediæval time had united them to the ecclesiastical empire of the Roman pontiffs. Since the secession movement was successful, it is rightly called a revolution, — the *Protestant Revolution*.

But the movement was something more than a successful rebellion against ecclesiastical authority. It was, as we shall learn, caused in large part by the existence of certain evils and abuses in the Church, and resulted in a great renovation of the religious and moral life of Western Christendom. Hence it is properly spoken of as a reform, — as the *Reformation*.

That the movement was a dual one should be carefully noted, for it is only when regarded from both the indicated points of view that its complex phenomena can be intelligently observed and rightly interpreted. In the present chapter we shall speak of the causes and the beginnings of the revolution; in succeeding chapters we shall follow the vicissitudes of its fortunes in the principal countries of Northern Europe.

315. Causes of the Reformation. — Our first endeavor must be to get some sort of comprehension of what caused the northern nations of Europe first to become dissatisfied with the state of things ecclesiastical and religious, and then to secede from the ancient Church. There were various causes.

One cause was the Renaissance, that great intellectual awakening which marked the close of the mediæval and the opening of

the modern epoch. As we have already learned, the revival of the liberal culture of classical antiquity evoked a critical, self-reliant spirit which was profoundly antagonistic to the whole mediæval system of ideas and practices. We shall see in a moment how it was the antagonism which developed between the promoters of the New Learning and the upholders of the scholastic theology that helped to prepare the way for the great schism.

A second cause of the revolution was the existence in the Church of most serious scandals and abuses. In many cases religion instead of being a thing of the heart had become, in a lamentable degree, merely a matter of ceremonies and outer observances. In practice, if not in theory, with many religion was regarded as one thing and morality as quite another. The necessity of the amendment of this state of things, of the thorough reform of the Church in both "head and members," was recognized by all earnest and spiritually minded men. The only difference of opinion among such was as to the manner in which the work of renovation should be effected, whether from within or from without, by reform or by revolution.

A third cause was jealousy of the Papacy on the part of the temporal princes, and the clash of papal claims with the rising sentiment of national patriotism. It is true that the claims to temporal supremacy put forward by some of the mediæval popes were no longer maintained; still there remained a very large field embracing matters such as appointment or nomination to Church offices, the taxation of the clergy and of Church property, questions concerning marriages, wills, and so on, which the popes as the guardians of religion claimed the right to regulate or to review. Thus the nations were really very far from being independent. As respects many matters which we now regard as attaching to national sovereignty, they were virtually provinces of an ecclesiastical world-empire centered at Rome.

The situation might be illustrated by a comparison with that in a federal commonwealth like our own. Just as in our Union every person owes allegiance to two authorities, that of his State and that of the Federal Government, so in mediæval times every

person owed allegiance to two authorities, — to his own king and to the Roman pontiff. And as before our Civil War it was often difficult for one to determine whether his first duty was to his own State or to the Federal Government, so before the Protestant Revolution it was often difficult for one to decide to which he owed superior allegiance, — to his own prince or to the Pope. As regards the monks and the other clergy, the question was apt to be decided in favor of the papal see, for they were prone to regard themselves as subjects of the Pope rather than as subjects of the king under whose rule they lived.

But it was at the point where the papal supremacy interfered with the financial interests of the lay governments that the most friction and trouble developed. As head of the Church the popes were drawing an immense revenue from every state embraced within the ecclesiastical empire. A large part of the landed property of Europe was in the hands of the Church, and a considerable portion of the vast revenues derived from it was, in the form of annates and contributions of the clergy, drawn into the Roman treasury. Furthermore, through the system of papal indulgences (sec. 320) vast additional sums were collected for papal use in all the different countries. In some countries the direct and indirect contributions of the people to the papal see probably exceeded the taxes which they paid to their own government. Moreover, it was a matter of notoriety that the immense sums drawn to Rome were not always used in the promotion of religious objects, but, in the hands of unworthy pontiffs, like Alexander VI, were used to further personal ambitions or to promote the political fortunes of the Papacy.

This state of things culminating just at the time when the sentiment of nationality was awakening in several of the different countries, and just when the secular governments, growing stronger, were assuming new functions and were requiring larger revenues for the maintenance of their standing armies and for other public purposes, it was inevitable that among the civil rulers the situation should come to be regarded with feelings of ill-will and impatience. It is doubtless true that in several of the northern countries it

was this condition of things which had more to do in bringing about the secession from Rome than had the desire of religious freedom or of moral reform.

The circumstances marking the outbreak of the revolution, which we shall now proceed to consider, will afford a commentary on this brief statement of the causes which produced it.

316. The Northern Humanists as Precursors of the Reformation. — In our study of the Italian Renaissance we noted how the revival, which in Italy had been in its essence a restoration of classical literature and culture, on crossing the Alps became equally a restoration of Hebrew-Christian antiquity, and thus also became one of the deepest lying causes of the Protestant Revolution (sec. 301). This relation of humanism to the Reformation will best be revealed by the presentation of a few facts illustrative of the spirit and aims of the humanists of the North.

317. The Oxford Humanist Reformers. — One of the earliest centers of humanism in the North was Oxford in England. Here we find, just as the old age was merging into the new, a celebrated group of humanists. Among them three men, Colet, Erasmus, and More, stand preëminent as promoters of the New Learning.

John Colet (1466–1519) was leader and master of the little band. His generous enthusiasm was kindled in Italy. It was an important event in the history of the Reformation when Colet crossed the Alps to learn Greek at the feet of the Greek exiles; for on his return to England he brought back with him not only an increased love for the classical learning but a fervent zeal for religious reform, inspired, perhaps, by the stirring eloquence of Savonarola. His lectures at Oxford on St. Paul's Epistles are said to have seemed to his listeners almost like a new revelation. The great influence of Colet upon the world was exerted for the most part indirectly, — through Erasmus and More, his disciples and fellow-workers.

Desiderius Erasmus (1467?–1536) of Rotterdam went to England to learn Greek. There he came into close friendship with Colet, More, and other lovers of learning, with whom he declared he could have been happy in Scythia. He was the leader of the

humanistic movement in the North, as Petrarch was the father of the movement in the South. His celebrated satire entitled *Moriæ Encomium*, or "Praise of Folly" (1509), was directed against the foibles of all classes of society, but particularly against the sins of "unholy men in holy orders." A little later (in 1516) Erasmus published his *Novum Instrumentum*, the Greek text of the New Testament with a Latin version. These publications must be given a prominent place among the agencies which prepared the minds and hearts of the northern peoples for the Reformation.



FIG. 56. — ERASMUS. (After a painting by *Holbein*)

Thomas More (1478–1535) was declared by Colet to be the sole genius in all England. He was a man with whom men were said to "fall in love." As the author of *Utopia* he is, perhaps, after Erasmus, the best known of all the humanists of the North. His work, while closely associated with the religious and social history of the Reformation period in England, had less significance than that of either Colet or Erasmus for the reform movement at large, and it is in connection with English history that we shall have occasion to refer to it again (sec. 377).

Than this early Oxford movement, nothing better illustrates the relation of the humanistic revival in the North to the religious reform. Here the humanist was the reformer. But the Oxford

reformers, it should be carefully noted, were not Protestant reformers. They believed in the divine character of the papal supremacy. They wished indeed to reform the Papacy, but not to destroy it. They did not wish to see the mediæval unity of Christendom broken. They had no quarrel with the creed of the Catholic Church. Erasmus denounced the doctrines of Luther, and More died a martyr's death rather than deny the papal supremacy.

318. **The German Humanists; John Reuchlin.** — Even before the influence of the Italian humanistic revival had begun to make itself felt in Germany, there had already sprung up in that country a movement, primarily intellectual, which owed little or nothing to that which at the same time was running its course in the southern land. This movement in its earlier stages was represented by an association known as the "Brethren of the Common Life." The members of this union founded schools and labored to render the education of youth practical and conducive to true piety. In these schools were nurtured some of the best scholars and best men of the time.[1]

Before the end of the fifteenth century this native movement, coming in contact with Italian humanism, received a great impulse therefrom, and developed rapidly and spread widely. The printing press poured out a flood of books. New universities were founded and became propagating centers of the liberal culture of the Renaissance. As was inevitable a conflict straightway sprang up between the monastic theologians, who were the champions of the old Scholasticism, and the promoters of the New Learning. It was the first phase in modern times of the age-long warfare between Theology and Science.

The first blows exchanged by the two parties were given in a controversy in which the real principle involved was the freedom of scholars in their investigations and the limits of theological authority in matters of scholarship. The war raged around the

[1] Three of the most eminent representatives of this early German revival were Thomas à Kempis (d. 1471), the reputed author of *The Imitation of Christ;* Jacob Wimpheling (1450–1528); and Sebastian Brant (1458–1521), who in his poem *Narrenschiff*, or "Ship of Fools," satirized with keenest wit evils in both State and Church.

person of the eminent humanist John Reuchlin (1455–1522), the same whom we have seen in the closing years of the fifteenth century trudging over the Alps in order to study Greek at the feet of the Italian masters (sec. 291).

Hostilities had arisen in this way. It had been proposed by haters of the Jews that their books should be taken from them and burned, on the ground that these works were unfriendly to Christianity. Reuchlin, who was the best Hebrew scholar of his time, was asked, by the authorities before whom the matter had been brought, for his opinion on the proposal. He advised against it, and embraced the opportunity to say that much of the Jewish literature might be read by Christians with great advantage to themselves. This caused Reuchlin to be bitterly attacked by the clerical party. The theological faculties of many of the German universities and that of the University of Paris condemned his views, while the humanists, among others Erasmus, sent him letters of approval and encouragement. Some of these Reuchlin published under the title of *Epistolæ Clarorum Virorum*, or "Letters from Illustrious Men."

The appearance of this collection suggested to some of Reuchlin's friends — the celebrated humanist and picturesque knight poet, Ulrich von Hutten (1488–1523), was among them — the putting out of a work bearing the title *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, or "Letters of Obscure Men" (1515–1517). This was a series of fictitious letters, written in "choicest bad Latin" and crowded with all sorts of absurdities, in which the party opposed to Reuchlin were made the subjects of rollicking satire and merciless ridicule. To the humanists it was "capital fun," as More wrote to Erasmus.

319. **The Humanistic Movement becomes a Religious Reform.** — The attacks of the humanists on the theologians had been inspired primarily not so much by religious feeling or moral indignation as by a love of sound scholarship and contempt for the ignorance and pedantry of the opposers of the New Learning.

The controversy now assumed a more serious phase. It took on the character of a religious debate, became a matter of conscience,

also became mixed with political matters, and then finally developed into open war between the two parties. The simple narration of events as they unfolded in Germany will best convey an idea of how circumstances, and the appearance of a great man with deep convictions and violent passions, gave this new trend to the historic movement.

320. **Indulgences; Purgatory; Jubilees.** — Since the subject-matter of the debate in its new form was papal indulgences, a word concerning these will here be necessary to render intelligible the opening episodes of the great revolution.

An indulgence, as understood and defined by German theologians of Luther's time, was the remission of that temporal punishment which often remains due on account of sin after its guilt has been forgiven.[2] It was granted on the performance of some work of piety, charity, or mercy, which often included an alms to the poor or a gift of money to promote some good work, and took effect only upon certain conditions, among which was that of confession of sin and sincere repentance.

Since much of the opposition to indulgences arose from their application to souls in purgatory and to abuses arising in this connection, a word of explanation is here also necessary.

According to Catholic teaching, the other world embraces three regions, — hell, purgatory, and heaven. This belief is embodied in the great poem of the mediæval ages, Dante's *Divine Comedy*. Purgatory is a place or state intermediate between heaven and hell, where souls destined for eternal bliss are cleansed through suffering. This belief in an intermediate place of punishment came to be of historical significance because, according to Catholic

2 The following is the definition given by Johann von Paltz, a contemporary of Luther, in his authoritative treatise on indulgences (*Cœlifodina*, ed. of 1511): *Indulgentia est remissio pœnæ temporalis debitæ peccatis actualibus pœnitentium non remissæ in absolutione sacramentali: facta a prælato ecclesiæ rationabiliter et ex rationabili causa: per recompensationem de pœna indebita justorum.* "An indulgence is a remission of that temporal penalty deserved by the actual sins of penitents which has not been remitted in sacramental absolution, — a remission granted by a prelate of the Church, in rational manner and for rational cause, on the ground of the penalty already paid by the undeserved punishment of the just." By "temporal" punishment is meant penances imposed by the Church and the temporary pains of purgatory, as opposed to the *eternal* punishment of hell.

doctrine, souls in this place of purification can be helped and their probation shortened by the prayers and good works of their surviving friends in their behalf. Thus Dante on the terraces of the Mount of Purification met spirits who told him that their allotted time of suffering had been shortened by the mediatorial prayers of their friends. The vast endowments of the mediæval monasteries were in large part given that Masses might be said for the repose of the souls of the donors. And not only were intercessory prayers counted capable of releasing souls from purgatory, but the indulgence was deemed valid also for the dead as well as for the living.

Before the time of the Reformation, indulgences had been frequently granted by various pontiffs, with different objects in view. Thus in the time of the Crusades plenary [3] indulgences were offered to all who assumed the cross. Indulgences were also often resorted to as a means of raising money for the construction and maintenance of churches, convents, and bridges, and for the promotion of other local undertakings. A great part of the money for the building of St. Peter's at Rome was obtained in this manner.

During the later mediæval period the system received a vast extension through the use of the indulgence to draw pilgrims to Rome. In the year 1300 Pope Boniface VIII proclaimed a jubilee, which was to be celebrated thereafter every hundredth year, and offered plenary indulgence to all who, during the year, should, in the proper spirit, visit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome. The crowds drawn to the capital by this inducement exceed belief. It seemed as though all Christendom were thronging into the Holy City. In following times the interval between one jubilee and the next was successively shortened until the term was reduced to twenty-five years. These recurring jubilees form one of the most striking features of the religious life of the later Middle Ages. By multiplying the offerings of the faithful they brought vast sums into the papal treasury, and thus greatly enhanced the power and influence of the holy see.

[3] A plenary or full indulgence remits to a penitent the whole of the temporal punishment to which he is liable at the time of receiving the remission.

321. Tetzel and the Preaching of Indulgences. — Leo X, upon his election to the papal dignity in 1513, found the coffers of the Church almost empty, and being in pressing need of money to carry on his various undertakings, among which was work upon St. Peter's, he had recourse to the now common expedient of a grant of indulgences. He delegated the power of dispensing these in a great part of Germany to Archbishop Albert of Mainz. As his deputy, Albert employed a Dominican friar by the name of John Tetzel.

The archbishop was unfortunate in the selection of his agent. Tetzel carried out his commission in such a way as to give rise to a great scandal. The language that he and his subordinates used in exhorting the people to comply with the conditions of gaining the indulgences — one of which was a donation of money — was unseemly and exaggerated.

The result was that erroneous views as to the effect of indulgences began to spread among the ignorant and credulous, many being so far misled as to think that if they only contributed this money to the building of St. Peter's in Rome they would be exempt from all penalty for sins, paying little heed to the other conditions, such as sorrow for sin and purpose of amendment. Hence serious persons were led to declaim against the procedure of the zealous friar. These protests were the near mutterings of a storm that had long been gathering, and that was soon to shake all Europe from the Baltic to the Mediterranean.

322. Martin Luther; his Pilgrimage to Rome. — Foremost among those who opposed and denounced the methods used by Tetzel was Martin Luther, an Augustinian monk and teacher of theology in the University of Wittenberg. This great reformer was born in Saxony in 1483. He was of humble parentage, his father being a poor miner. Just as a career planned by his father in the profession of the law was opening before him, he suddenly turned his back upon the world and entered a convent.

Before Tetzel appeared in Germany, Luther had already earned a wide reputation for learning and piety. A few years before this (in 1511) he had made, in the interest of his order, a memorable

journey to Rome. His reverence for Rome and the Pope was at that time unimpaired. Rome was in his eyes as sacred as Jerusalem. The Pope he regarded as God's representative on earth. He had no doubts about purgatory; he was almost sorry that his parents were not dead that he might, at the holy places in Rome, pray their souls out of that place of suffering.

FIG. 57. — MARTIN LUTHER. (After the portrait by *Lucas Cranach*, the elder; Uffizi Gallery, Florence)

But the simple German monk saw things at Rome which gave his reverence a rude shock. He had expected to see every one "awed in perpetual reverence by the holy atmosphere of the place." Instead, he found luxury and skepticism, — often open profligacy and irreverence for holy things. All this produced a deep impression upon the serious-minded monk. The seed had been sown which was destined to yield a great harvest.

323. The Ninety-Five Theses (1517). — It was six years after Luther's visit to Rome when Tetzel began in the neighborhood of Wittenberg, where Luther was, the preaching of indulgences in the scandalous manner to which we have just alluded. The people were running in great crowds after the preacher of indulgences. Luther was greatly distressed. Not being able to get any one in authority to intervene to put a stop to the scandal, he resolved to take hold of the matter himself. Accordingly he drew

up ninety-five theses bearing on indulgences, and nailed them upon the door of the castle church at Wittenberg. It was a custom of those times for a scholar thus to post propositions which he was willing to maintain against any and all comers. An examination of the theses shows that Luther at this time still held the generally accepted view both as to purgatory and the validity of indulgences, and that his protest was aimed only at abuses.

By means of the press the theses were spread broadcast. They were eagerly read and commented upon by all classes, particularly in Germany. Tetzel issued counter-propositions. Learned theologians[4] entered the lists against the presumptuous monk. The air was thick with controversial leaflets. At first Pope Leo had been inclined to make light of the whole matter, declaring that it was "a mere squabble of monks," but at length he felt constrained to take decisive measures against Luther. The monk was to be silenced by means of a papal bull.

324. Luther's "Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation" (July, 1520). — Luther heard that the bull was soon to be launched against him. He anticipated its arrival by the issuance to the German nobility of a remarkable address, which has been called "The Manifesto of the Reformation." This was beyond question the most significant historically of all the productions of this age of theses and counter-theses, of bulls and bans, of manifestoes and appeals. It was practically a German declaration of independence of Rome.

Luther demanded, among other things, that payment to the Pope of annates[5] should be forbidden by the princes, nobles,

[4] Prominent among these disputants were Cardinal Cajetan (1469–1534) and John Eck (1486–1543).

[5] Annates, or first fruits, were the first year's revenue, or some portion of the first year's revenue, of a benefice paid to the Pope by a bishop, abbot, or other ecclesiastic for the papal confirmation in his office. This was a most important source of revenue to the Roman court. The temporal princes naturally regarded these payments by their subjects to the Pope with great jealousy, since in this way immense sums of money passed out of their dominions and into the Roman treasury. Consequently this subject of annates was a source of endless disagreement and controversy between the civil governments of Europe and the Papacy. In England the prohibition of the payment of first fruits to the Pope was one of the earliest steps taken in the separation from Rome. See sec. 370.

and cities, or that they should be wholly abolished; that "no episcopal cloak and no confirmation of an appointment should be obtained from Rome"; that the Pope should have no power whatever over the Emperor, "save to anoint and crown him at the altar"; and that the secular clergy should be free to marry or not to marry.[6]

325. **Luther burns the Papal Bull** (Dec. 10, 1520). — At length a copy of the papal bull came into Luther's hands. Forty-one propositions selected from his writings were therein condemned either as "heretical" or as "scandalous," and all persons were forbidden to read his books, which were ordered to be burned; and he himself, if he did not retract his errors within sixty days, was, together with all his adherents, to be regarded as having "incurred the penalty due for heresy."

Luther now took a startling determination. He resolved to burn the papal bull. A fire was kindled outside one of the gates of Wittenberg, and in the presence of a great throng of doctors, students, and citizens, Luther cast the bull, together with the papal decretals and some books of his opponents, into the flames.

The audacious proceeding raised a terrible storm, which raged "high as the heavens, wide as the earth." Luther wrote a friend that he believed the tempest could never be stilled before the day of judgment.

326. **The Diet of Worms** (1521). — Affairs had now assumed a threatening aspect. All Germany was in a state of revolt. The papal supremacy was imperiled. The papal ban having failed to produce any effect, Pope Leo now invoked the aid of the recently elected Emperor Charles V in extirpating the spreading heresy. He wished Luther to be sent to Rome for trial there. Luther's friends, however, persuaded Charles not to accede to the Pope's request, but to permit Luther to be heard in Germany.

[6] Luther was not at this time ready to release monks from their vows. Gradually, however, his views changed and he came to regard the celibacy of the monks as opposed to Scripture teachings. In the year 1525, acting upon his maturer views, he married Catharine Bora, a former nun. This violation by Luther of his monastic vows was made the subject of bitter reproach against him by his enemies.

Accordingly Luther received an imperial summons to appear at Worms before an assembly of the princes, nobles, and clergy of Germany to be convened for the purpose of deliberating upon the affairs of the country, and especially upon matters touching the great religious controversy.

Luther's journey to Worms was a triumphal progress. The eyes of all Germany were upon him. The crowds that lined the streets of the towns through which he passed showed how profoundly the German heart had been stirred. At Worms the roofs of the houses along the streets traversed by the monk in his entrance into the city were loaded with his sympathizers.[7]

When Luther first appeared before the brilliant and august assembly he was visibly embarrassed. But he soon recovered his composure. His books were placed before him, and he was asked whether he would retract what he had written therein. He requested a day's time to consider his answer. The next day, brought again before the Diet, he replied in substance: "To revoke these writings would be to give new force and audacity to the Roman tyranny. I cannot, I will not, retract anything, unless what I have written shall be shown to be contrary to Holy Scripture or to plain reason, for to act against conscience is neither safe nor upright." His closing words were impressive: "I can do no otherwise; here I stand, God help me, Amen."

Although some wished to deliver the reformer to the flames, the safe-conduct of the Emperor under which he had come to the Diet protected him. So Luther was allowed to depart in safety, but was followed by the ban of the Empire.

327. **Luther at the Wartburg** (1521–1522). — Luther, however, had powerful friends, among whom was his own prince, Frederick the Wise, Elector of Saxony. Solicitous for the safety of the reformer, the prince caused him to be seized on his way from the Diet by a company of masked horsemen, who carried

[7] As Luther neared Worms it was whispered to him that treason against him was being planned within the city. His friends, alarmed at this report, tried to dissuade him from exposing his life by going on. It was then he made his famous declaration, "I would go though there were as many devils there as there are tiles on the roofs of the houses."

him to the castle of the Wartburg, where he was kept about a year, his retreat being known only to a few friends.

During this period of forced retirement from the world Luther was busy writing pamphlets and translating the Bible. Appeal had been made to the Scriptures, — "Prove it from the Scriptures," "There it is written," was the constant challenge of the reformers to their opponents, — hence it was necessary that the Scriptures should be accessible in a language understood by all.[8] It was hard work, as Luther put it, to make the old prophets speak German, but he made them speak it in a way which has fixed to this day the attention of the German nation.

In giving Germany this translation of the Bible, Luther rendered some such service to the German tongue as Dante rendered to the Italian through his *Divine Comedy*. Fixing its literary forms, he virtually created the German language out of a chaos of dialects.

328. **The Peasants' War** (1524–1525). — Before quite a year had passed Luther was drawn from the Wartburg by the troubles caused by certain radical reformers whose preaching was occasioning tumult and violence, and thereby bringing into discredit the whole reform movement. Luther's sudden appearance at Wittenberg gave a temporary check to the agitation.

But in the course of two or three years the trouble broke out afresh, and in a more complex and aggravated form. The peasants of Suabia and Franconia, stung to madness by the oppressions of their feudal lords, stirred by the religious excitement that filled the air, and influenced by the incendiary preaching of their prophets Carlstadt and Münzer, rose in revolt against the nobles and the priests, — against all in authority.[9] Castles and monasteries were sacked and burned, and horrible outrages were committed. The rebellion was finally crushed, but not until a hundred thousand lives had been sacrificed, a large part of South Germany devastated, and great reproach cast upon the

[8] There had been before this translations of the Bible into German, but the editions had been small and the circulation limited.

[9] The demands of the peasants were embodied in a document known as the Twelve Articles. See *Translations and Reprints* (Univ. of Penn.), vol. ii, No. 6.

reformers, whose teachings were held by their enemies to be the whole cause of the ferment.[10]

329. **The Secularization of Church Property.** — But in spite of all these discrediting movements the reform made rapid progress. Nothing contributed more to win over the lay princes to the views of Luther than his recommendation that the monasteries should be suppressed and their property confiscated and devoted to the maintenance of churches, schools, and charities.[11]

The lay rulers were quick to act upon this suggestion, and to go far beyond it. Within a very few years after the appearance of Luther's address to the German nobility and another treatise of his on monastic vows (1522), wherein he pronounced such vows to be contrary to true Christian principles, there were confiscations of ecclesiastical property in all the German states that had become Protestant.

In Sweden, in which country the doctrines of Luther gained an early foothold, almost all the property of the old Church was, by an act of the National Diet, given into the hands of the king, Gustavus Vasa (1524). This wealth contributed greatly to enhance the power and prestige of the Swedish monarchy.

In England, King Henry VIII, under circumstances which we shall consider in another chapter, suppressed the monasteries and diverted to secular uses the greater part of their wealth.

But the classical instance of the secularizing of Church property during this period is afforded by the case of the Teutonic Knights (sec. 154). At the beginning of the Protestant revolt these monk knights ruled over from two to three million subjects. When the reform movement began to spread over Germany the Grand Master of the order, Albert of Brandenburg, turned Protestant, and converted the domains of the fraternity into an hereditary

[10] About a decade after the suppression of the Peasants' Revolt the religious excitement of the time brought into existence the so-called New Zion, or Anabaptist kingdom of Münster, a sort of theocracy, of which the head was John of Leyden (1510?–1536). There was in this movement a most startling exhibition of religious fanaticism. Like the rebellion of the peasants, it tended greatly to discredit the genuine reform party.

[11] All such taking over of Church property by the state was called "secularization."

principality under the name of the Duchy of Prussia (1525). The knights married and became nobles. Thus was created out of ecclesiastical lands a most important secular state.

330. The Reformers are called Protestants; the Augsburg Confession. — The rapid progress of the revolution alarmed the upholders of the ancient Church. In the year 1529 there gathered an assembly known as the Second Diet of Spires to consider the matter. The action of the Catholic majority of this body took away from the Protestant princes and cities the right they had hitherto enjoyed of determining what form of religion should be followed in their domains, and forbade the teaching of certain of the new doctrines until a Church council should have pronounced authoritatively upon them.

Six of the German princes and a large number of the cities of the Empire issued a formal protest against the action of the Diet, denying the power or right of a majority to bind the minority in matters of religion and conscience. Because of this *protest*, the reformers from this time began to be known as *Protestants*.

The year following that in which this protest was made the adherents of Luther, at the request of the Emperor Charles, laid before another Diet assembled at Augsburg (1530) their formula of belief, known as the Augsburg Confession. It was drawn up by the eminent scholar Melanchthon, and came to form the basis of the Lutheran Church.

331. The Catholic Reaction; its Causes and Agents. — Even before the death of Luther, which occurred in the year 1546,[12] the Reformation had gained a strong foothold in most of the countries of Western Christendom, save in Spain and Italy, and even in these parts the new doctrines had made some progress. But several causes now conspired to check the hitherto triumphant advance of Protestantism and to enable the old Church to regain much of the ground that had been lost. Chief among

[12] After the death of Luther the leadership of the Reformation in Germany fell to Philip Melanchthon (1497–1560), one of Luther's friends and fellow-workers. Melanchthon's disposition was exactly the opposite of Luther's. He often reproved Luther for his indiscretion and vehemence, and was constantly laboring to effect, through mutual concessions, a reconciliation between the Catholics and Protestants.

these were the divisions among the Protestants, the Counter-Reform in the Catholic Church, the increased activity of the Inquisition, the rise of the Society of the Jesuits, and Spain's zealous championship of Catholicism.

332. Divisions among the Protestants. — Early in their contest with the Roman see the Protestants became divided into three mutually hostile sects,— Lutherans, Zwinglians, and Calvinists.

The creed of the Lutherans came to prevail very generally in North Germany, and was received in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. It also spread into the Netherlands, but there it was soon overshadowed by Calvinism. Of all the Protestant sects the Lutherans made the least departure from the Catholic Church.

The Zwinglians, followers of Huldreich Zwingli (1484–1531), differed from the Lutherans particularly in their views regarding the Eucharist and in the matter of church organization. Their creed became dominant in the greater part of German Switzerland, and from there spread into Southern Germany.

FIG. 58. — JOHN CALVIN. (After a painting by *Holbein*)

The Calvinists were followers of John Calvin (1509–1564), a Frenchman by birth, who, forced to flee from France on account of persecution, found a refuge at Geneva,[13] which city he made the center of a movement even more extended and historically important than that having its point of departure at Wittenberg. We can best remember the wide range of Calvinism and its

[13] Under the influence of Calvin, Geneva became a sort of theocratic state, with the reformer as a Protestant pope. The laws and regulations of this little city-state recall those of the later Puritan commonwealth in England. Calvinism was everywhere the same. It was a sort of revival of the theocracy of the ancient Hebrews. Calvin has been well called the "Prophet of the Old Covenant."

remarkable influence upon the history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by keeping in mind that the French Huguenots, the Scotch Covenanters, the Dutch Netherlanders (in large part), the English Puritans, and the Pilgrim Fathers were all Calvinists.[14]

These great Protestant communions finally broke up into a large number of denominations or churches, each holding to some minor point of doctrine or adhering to some form of worship disregarded by the others, yet all agreeing in the central doctrine of the Reformation, "justification by faith alone."

Now, the contentions between these different sects were sharp and bitter. The liberal-minded reformer had occasion to lament the same state of things as that which troubled the Apostle Paul in the early days of Christianity. One said, I am of Luther; another said, I am of Calvin; and another said, I am of Zwingli. Even Luther himself denounced Zwingli as a heretic; and the Calvinists would have no dealings with the Lutherans.

The influence of these sectarian strifes and divisions upon the progress of the reform movement was most disastrous. They weakened the Protestant party in the presence of a united and vigilant enemy. They afforded the Catholics a strong and effective argument against the entire movement as tending to uncertainty and discord.

333. **The Catholic Counter-Reform; the Council of Trent** (1545–1563); **Carlo Borromeo.** — As we have seen, it was the existence of acknowledged evils and scandals in the old Church that had contributed greatly to undermine its authority and to weaken its hold upon the reverence and the consciences of men. It was the correction of these evils and the removal of these scandals which did much to restore its lost influence and authority.

This reform, which even before the rise of Protestantism had already begun within the Catholic Church, was carried out in great measure by the memorable Council of Trent (1545–1563).

[14] All these are great names in the history of *political* liberty. The undeniably favorable influence of Calvinism upon civil liberty is doubtless to be attributed not so much to its creed as to the democratic constitution of the Calvinistic churches. Each church forms a little democracy, and naturally ecclesiastical democracy has fostered political democracy.

This body, the most important Church assembly since that of Nicæa, A.D. 325, with the voice of authority passed upon all the points that had been raised by the reformers. It declared the traditions of the Church to be of equal authority with the Bible; it reasserted the divine character of the Papacy; it condemned as heresy the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone. It made everything so clear that no one, not even a wayfaring man, need err either in doctrine or in duty. It also demanded that the lives of all priests and bishops should be an exemplification of Christian purity and morality.

These measures of the council helped greatly to check the Protestant movement. The correction of the abuses that had had so much to do in causing the great schism, smoothed the way for the return to the ancient Church of thousands who had become alarmed at the dangers into which society seemed to drift when once it cast loose from anchorage in the safe harbor of tradition and authority.

The spirit in which the Council of Trent had done its work finds illustration in the exalted character and devoted life of the Italian reformer, Carlo Borromeo (1538–1588). In him the reforming spirit of the great council was incarnate. He became Archbishop of Milan, and took as his model the holy Ambrose, who, twelve centuries before, in the corrupt times of the failing Roman Empire, had won sainthood in that same see. He renovated and restored the desecrated and deserted churches, reformed the lax and dissolute lives of the clergy, restored discipline in the religious orders, and established schools and colleges. It was due largely to his zealous labors and to the happy contagion of his holy example that a new spiritual life was created in Milan and the regions round about, that popular veneration for the ancient Church was again evoked, that the progress of Protestantism in Italy was stayed, and that the wavering were held firm in their allegiance to the Papacy and many who had already been led away by the Protestant heresy were brought back to the ancient fold.

334. **The Inquisition.** — The Catholic Church, having purified itself and defined clearly its articles of faith, demanded of all

a more implicit obedience than hitherto. The Inquisition now assumed new vigor and activity, and heresy was sternly dealt with. The tribunal was assisted in the execution of its sentences by the secular authorities in all the Romance countries, but outside of these it was not generally recognized by the temporal princes, though it did succeed in establishing itself for a time in the Netherlands and in some parts of Germany. Death, usually by burning, and loss of property were the penalty of obstinate heresy. Without doubt the Inquisition did much to check the advance of the Reformation in Southern Europe, aiding especially in holding Italy and Spain obedient to the ancient Church.

At this point, in connection with the persecutions of the Inquisition, we should not fail to recall that in the sixteenth century a refusal to conform to the established worship was regarded by the great majority of Protestants, as well as of Catholics, as a species of treason against society, and was dealt with accordingly. Thus at Geneva we find Calvin bending all his energies to the trial and execution of Servetus, because he published views that the Calvinists thought heretical; and in England we see the Anglican Protestants waging the most cruel, bitter, and persistent persecutions, not only against the Catholics, but also against all Protestants who refused to conform to the Established Church.



FIG. 59. — IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA
(After a painting by *Rubens*)

335. The Society of the Jesuits; Ignatius of Loyola; Francis Xavier. — The Society of the Jesuits, or the Company of Jesus, was another most powerful auxiliary concerned in the reëstablishment of the threatened authority of the papal see. The founder of the fraternity was Ignatius of Loyola (1491–1556), a native of Spain. Ignatius

was the embodiment of Spanish religious zeal. His object was to form a society the devotion and energy of whose members should meet the ardor and activity of the reformers. The new society was instituted by a papal bull in 1540.

Ignatius before he became a priest was a soldier, and it was this circumstance which lent a military cast to his society. Indeed, the military principle so characterizes it that it has been described as "a military organization for religious purposes." This predominance of the military principle in the society should be borne carefully in mind in any study of the character and the activity of the Jesuits. Like the soldier, each member of the society is required to submit his own will to that of his superior, and is taught to regard self-renunciation and obedience as cardinal virtues.

It was particularly as educators that the Jesuits made their influence felt upon society. Their aim here was to fill the world with schools and colleges, just as a conquered country might be occupied with military garrisons. Ignatius left behind him a full hundred colleges and seminaries; within a century and a half after his death the order had founded over seven hundred.

As the well-disciplined, watchful, and uncompromising foes of the Protestants, now divided into many and often hostile sects, the Jesuits did so much to bring about a reaction that Macaulay declares, "The history of the Jesuits is the history of the Catholic Reaction." It was largely through their direct or indirect agency that Hungary, Poland, Bohemia, and South Germany, after they had been invaded by Protestantism and in a greater or less degree drawn away from the old faith, were won back to the Catholic Church and again bound by stronger ties than ever to the Papacy. By the end of the sixteenth century this great work of recovery had been in the main accomplished. This regaining of these debatable countries for Catholicism constitutes one of the most important matters in the religious history of Europe.

And not only did the labors of the Jesuits contribute thus greatly to the retrieving of the papal fortunes in Europe, but they were also instrumental in extending the authority and spreading the doctrines of the Catholic Church into all other parts of the

world. Most distinguished of all the missionaries of the society to pagan lands was the saintly Francis Xavier (1506–1552), known as the "Apostle of the Indies." His charity was measureless, his courage heroic. He thought that he should be as ready to face danger in quest of souls as others were in quest of "aromatic groves and mines of gold." His labors in India, Japan, and other lands of the Far East were attended with astonishing results.

336. **Spain's Zealous Championship of Catholicism.** — Just as England became the champion and the bulwark of Protestantism, so did Spain become the champion and the bulwark of Catholicism. The Spanish sovereigns, as we shall see, constituted themselves the guardians of Catholic orthodoxy, and put forth all their strength to uproot the reformed faith not only in their own domains but also in other lands. Their strenuous efforts to reëstablish the old religious unity caused them to become most important instruments of the Catholic Restoration.

337. **The Hundred Years of Religious Wars.** — The action taken by the Council of Trent made impossible a reconciliation between the two parties. The middle of the sixteenth century had not yet been reached before the increasing bitterness of their controversy led to an appeal to force. Then followed a hundred years of religious wars. During this time neither party laid aside the sword. The Schmalkaldic War in Germany between Charles V and the Protestant princes, the fierce struggle in the Netherlands between Philip II of Spain and his revolted subjects, the Huguenot wars in France, the launching of the Spanish Armada against Protestant England, the Thirty Years' War in Germany, — all these were simply different acts of the long and terrible drama. In this protracted combat Protestantism was fighting desperately for the right to live; the Papacy was fighting to put down secession, to force the seceded states back into the old ecclesiastical empire, to restore the broken unity of Christendom.

In the chapters immediately following this we shall trace in broad outline the vicissitudes in the fortunes of the rival creeds in the leading European countries. To what we have here said

concerning the beginnings of the Revolution we will in a closing paragraph add only a single word touching its results.

338. **Outcomes of the Revolt.** — The outcome of the Protestant Revolution *as a revolution* was, very broadly stated, the separation from the Catholic Church of North Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, England, and Scotland, along with parts of Switzerland and of the Netherlands, — in the main, nations of Teutonic race. The great Romance nations, namely, France, Spain, and Italy, together with South Germany, Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, and Ireland, adhered to the ancient Church, or, if for a period shaken in their loyalty, ultimately returned to their old allegiance.[15]

What this separation from Rome meant in the political realm is well stated by Seebohm: "It was the claiming by the civil power in each nation of those rights which the Pope had hitherto claimed within it as head of the great ecclesiastical empire. The clergy and monks had hitherto been regarded more or less as foreigners, — that is, as subjects of the Pope's ecclesiastical empire. Where there was a revolt from Rome the allegiance of these persons to the Pope was annulled, and the civil power claimed as full a sovereignty over them as it had over its lay subjects. Matters relating to marriage and wills still for the most part remained under ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but then, as the ecclesiastical courts themselves became national courts and ceased to be Roman or papal, all these matters came under the control of the civil power."

In a word, the secession meant that the nations thus breaking the ties which formerly united them to Rome now became — what they were not during mediæval times — absolutely independent or sovereign powers, self-centered and self-governed in their ecclesiastical as well as in their political life.

In a spiritual or religious point of view, this severance by the northern nations of the bonds that formerly united them to the

[15] It is because the Reformation was espoused so generally by the Teutonic peoples and Catholicism adhered to so generally by the Latin nations that Protestantism is sometimes spoken of as Teutonic Christianity and Catholicism as Latin Christianity.

ecclesiastical empire of Rome meant a transfer of their allegiance from the *Church* to the *Bible*. The decrees of popes and the decisions of Church councils were no longer to be regarded as having divine and binding force; the Scriptures alone were to be held as possessing divine and infallible authority, and, theoretically, this rule and standard of faith and practice each individual was to interpret for himself.

Another important result of the Reformation was a certain impulse given the world in the direction of religious toleration. It is true that the reformers, in spite of their insistence for themselves upon the right of private judgment in religious matters, did not in practice concede this right to others, and when they had the power became, very inconsistently, most zealous persecutors. They believed with the Catholics that heresy should be punished, only they defined heresy differently. Throughout the sixteenth century intolerance, in the words of the historian Lingard, was "a part of the public law of Christendom." Nevertheless the proclamation of the principle of private judgment in religious affairs, through a logical necessity, came ultimately to exert a favorable influence upon toleration; for you cannot accord to a man the right to form his own judgment respecting a matter and at the same time affix a penalty to his reaching any save a prescribed conclusion. Consequently among the various agencies, such as modern science, the advance of the world in general intelligence, and closer intercourse among the nations, which during the past three centuries have brought in the beneficent principle of religious toleration, the Reformation of the sixteenth century must be given a prominent place.

Selections from the Sources. — *First Principles of the Reformation* (ed. by Wace and Buchheim). Read Luther's "Address to the Nobility of the German Nation." The address makes a vivid revelation, not only of the religious situation in Germany at this time, but also of the character of the man who here makes himself the spokesman of the German nation. WHITCOMB, *Literary Source-Book of the German Renaissance. Historical Leaflets* (Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Penn.), No. 2, "Tetzel's Theses on Indulgences." *Translations and Reprints*, vol. ii, No. 6, "Period

of the Early Reformation in Germany" (ed. by James Harvey Robinson and Merrick Whitcomb); and vol. iii, No. 3, "Period of the Later Reformation" (ed. by Merrick Whitcomb).

Secondary Works. — SEEBOHM, *The Oxford Reformers.* A volume of rare freshness and charm on the fellow-work and influence of the Oxford reformers, — Colet, Erasmus, and More. BEARD, *Martin Luther and the Reformation in Germany* (to 1520). KÖSTLIN, *Life of Luther.* EMERTON, *Desiderius Erasmus.* For a wider survey, from the Protestant point of view, of the reform movement: FISHER, *The Reformation;* HÄUSSER, *The Period of the Reformation;* and SEEBOHM, *The Era of the Protestant Revolution.* For the history of the movement from the Catholic side: SPALDING, *The History of the Protestant Reformation;* and ALZOG, *Universal Church History*, vol. iii, pp. 1–460. HENDERSON, *A Short History of Germany*, vol. i, chaps. x–xvi. JANSSEN, *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages*, vols. iii and iv. *The Cambridge Modern History*, vol. i, chap. xix, and vol. ii, chaps. iv–viii. WHITCOMB, *A History of Modern Europe*, pp. 33–64. ROBINSON, *An Introduction to the History of Western Europe*, chaps. xxv and xxvi. FROUDE, *Lectures on the Council of Trent.* HUGHES, *Loyola and the Educational System of the Jesuits.* SYMONDS, *The Catholic Reaction*, vol. i.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Erasmus and his *Praise of Folly.* 2. John Reuchlin. 3. Luther at the Diet of Worms. 4. Melanchthon. 5. Calvin and Servetus. 6. Carlo Borromeo. 7. Ignatius of Loyola.

CHAPTER XXI

THE ASCENDANCY OF SPAIN; HER RELATION TO THE CATHOLIC REACTION

I. Reign of the Emperor Charles V (1519–1556)

339. Charles' Dominions. — In the year 1500 there was born in the city of Ghent, in the Netherlands, a prince who was destined to play a great part in the history of the sixteenth century. This was Charles, son of Philip the Handsome, Archduke of Austria, and Joanna, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, — later to be known to fame as the Emperor Charles V.

Fig. 60. — Emperor Charles V (After a painting by *Holbein*)

Charles was "the converging point and heir of four great royal lines, which had become united by a series of happy matrimonial alliances." These were the houses of Austria, Burgundy, Castile, and Aragon. Before Charles had completed his nineteenth year there were heaped upon his head, through the removal by death of his ancestors, the crowns of the four dynasties.

But great as was the number of the hereditary crowns of the young prince, there was straightway added to them (in 1519), by the vote of the Electors of Germany, the crown of the Holy Roman Empire. After this election he was known as the *Emperor Charles V;* hitherto he had borne the title of *Carlos I* of Spain.

340. The Balance of Power is disturbed by Spain. — When Charles VIII of France, just at the close of the Middle Ages, made his memorable invasion of Italy, the other states became alarmed lest France should gain an undue weight in European affairs, and to prevent this formed an alliance to keep France within her proper boundaries (sec. 240). This was practically the origin of the celebrated system of the balance of power among the European states.[1]

From that time to the present this balance of power idea has lain at the bottom of much European diplomacy. It has been the concern of statesmen to see to it that no one of the nations should acquire an overweight of power or influence, and thereby endanger the independence of the others. But notwithstanding this interested vigilance there has been a constant tendency to a disturbance of the equilibrium of the European system of states through the overgrowth of this or that member of it. Thus in the seventeenth century France under Louis XIV, and then again in the early years of the nineteenth century under Napoleon, acquired such an ascendancy as to imperil the liberties of the continent. The alliances formed, treaties solemnly sworn to, and wars fought to prevent such disturbances of the balance of power or to restore the equilibrium already impaired, make up a great part of the political history of Europe in modern times.

Now, in the sixteenth century it was the overshadowing greatness of Spain that aroused the fears of Europe. Her preponderance disturbed alarmingly the equilibrium of the European system, and this very largely determined the policies and actions of the other states. Here we have the key to much of the political history of the reign of the Emperor Charles V and of that of his son and successor on the Spanish throne, Philip II.

341. Charles and the Reformation. — But important as is the political side of Charles' reign, it is his relation to the Lutheran

[1] There was, however, no general official recognition of such a doctrine until 1668, when the Triple Alliance (Sir William Temple's Treaty) was formed between the English, the Dutch, and the Swedes to prevent Louis XIV from making himself master of the Low Countries.

movement which constitutes for us the significant feature of his life and work. Fortunately for the Catholic Church, the young Emperor placed himself at the head of the Catholic party, and not only during his own reign employed the strength and resources of his empire in extirpating the heresy of the reformers, but also transmitted this policy to his successors upon the Spanish throne.

Charles, in declaring for the old faith and against the new, was swayed both by conviction and by considerations of policy. Although suspicious and jealous of the Papacy, he was strongly attached to the Catholic Church and creed, and sincerely believed that the first duty of a prince was to uproot heresy in his dominions. Then, again, as head of the Empire, Charles was impelled in the same direction. For he held the prevalent view of his age, that no state could tolerate two creeds, that political unity required religious unity; and this maxim he applied not only to Spain and his other hereditary possessions, but to his dominions as a whole, and, as we shall see, tried to suppress the reformed faith in Germany as well as elsewhere.

342. **His Two Chief Enemies.** — Had Charles been free from the outset to devote all his energies to the work of suppressing the Lutheran heresy, it is difficult to see what could have saved the reform doctrines within his dominions from extirpation. But, fortunately for the cause of the reformers, Charles' attention, during all the first part of his reign, was drawn away from the serious consideration of Church questions by the attacks upon his dominions of two of the most powerful monarchs of the times, — Francis I (1515–1547) of France, and Solyman the Magnificent (1520–1566), Sultan of Turkey. Time and again, when Charles was inclined to proceed to severe measures against the Protestant princes of Germany, the threatening movements of one or both of these enemies, at times acting in concert and alliance, forced him to postpone his proposed crusade against heretics for a campaign against foreign foes.

343. **Rivalry and Wars between Charles and Francis (1521–1544).** — Francis I was the rival of Charles in the contest for the imperial dignity. When the Electors of Germany conferred the

EUROPE
AT THE ACCESSION OF THE EMPEROR
CHARLES V
1519
Boundary of Empire thus:
0 50 100 200 300 400
Scale of Miles.
Longitude West 0
Longitude East 10 from Greenwich
ATLANTIC OCEAN
North Sea
Bay of Biscay
MEDITERRANEAN
ENGLAND
SCOTLAND
IRELAND
FRANCE
SPAIN
PORTUGAL
THE EMPIRE
DENMARK
NORWAY
Hebrides Islands
Orkney Is.
Bergen
Aberdeen
Edinburgh
Perth
Glasgow
Rhoddes
Carlisle
Durham
York
Lincoln
Chester
Norwich
Oxford
London
Dover
Bristol
Portsmouth
Plymouth
Dublin
Limerick
Cork
Galway
Wexford
Calais
Boulogne
Canterbury
Cateau Cambresis
Rouen
Brest
Britanny
St Quentin
Ivry
Paris
Crespy
Rheims
Vassy
Orleans
Amboise
Nantes
Tours
La Rochelle
Bordeaux
Angoulesme
Bergerac
Lyons
Geneva
Coruana
Santiago
Leon
Burgos
Oporto
Coimbra
Valladolid
Salamanca
Almeida
Sarragossa
Madrid
Alcantara
Toledo
Lisbon
Seville
Cordova
Granada
Murcia
Palos
Alpujarra Mts.
Cadiz
Malaga
Gibraltar
Tangier
Ceuta
Cartagena
Valencia
Ivica
Majorca
Minorca
Barcelona
Tarragona
Bedrn
Narbonne
Perpignan
Montauban
Orange
Avignon
Papalo
Turin
Nice
Marseilles
Toulon
Corsica (To Genoa)
Sardinia (To Spain)
Milan
Genoa
Piss
Florence
Modena
Mantua
Venice
Ravenna
Bologna
Ancona
Spalato
Rome
Naples
Benevento
Otranto
Messina
Palermo
Sicily (To Spain)
Syracuse
Reggio
Malta (To Spain)
Tripoli (To Spain)
Gerba (Turkish)
Susa
Kairawan
Tunis
Bona
Goletta
Bizerta
Algiers
Oran
Pashalik of Algiers (Turkish)
Hafsids
Augsburg
Munich
Vienna
Buda
Prague
Dresden
Leipsig
Saxony
Hesse
Wittenberg
Magdeburg
Berlin
Brandenburg
Munster
Bremen
Hamburg
Lubeck
Holstein
Schleswick
Copenhagen
Calmar
Lund
Frankfurt
Mentz
Heidelberg
Strasburg
Wurtzburg
Ausburg
Swiss Confederates
Bern
Geneva
Tyrol
Styria
Trent
Milan
Turin
Savoy
Lorrain
Burgundy
Liege
Cleves
Juliers
Treves
Cologne
Aix la Chapelle
Metz
Toul
Verdun
Brabant
Flanders
Zealand
Holland
Friesland
Utrecht
Groningen
Embden
Munster
Osnaburg
Hanover
Brunswick
Saxe Lawenburg
Mecklenburg
Pomerania
Prussia
Dantzic
Breslau
Silesia
Moravia
Hungary
Transylvania
Bosnia
Servia
Croatia
Dalmatia
Albania
Romania
Venice
Venetian States
Neapolitan States
Papal States
Tuscany
Genoa
Piedmont
Savoy
Switzerland
Germany
Italy
France
Spain
Portugal
Empire
Ocean
Sea
Bay
Mediterranean

Helsingfors
Revel
Narva
Esthonia
Livonia
Riga
Courland
Novgorod
RUSSIA
R. Volga
Valdimir
Moscow
R. Oka
Kasan
KHANATE OF KAZAN
Smolensk
R. Desna
Teutonic Order
Wilna
Lithuania
Warsaw
POLAND
Kiev
R. Dniester
Galicia
Podolia
KHANATE OF CRIMEA
R. Don
R. Volga
KHANATE OF ASTRAKHAN
Kalmuks
Astrakhan
Caspian Sea
Transylvania
Moldavia
R. Dniester
Akerman
Kronstadt
Belgrade
Wallachia
Silistria
Black Sea
GEORGIA
Baku
Nicopolis
Bulgaria
Varna
Sofia
Philippopolis
Adrianople
Constantinople
Scutari
Sinope
Trebizond
Kars
Erzerum
Van
Salonika
Brusa
Angora
Larissa
Bergama
Lepanto
Chios
Smyrna
Marash
Turkadr
Mosul
Athens
Aleppo
Antioch
Hamah
Knights of St. John
Rhodes
Cerigo
Candia
Crete (To Venice)
Cyprus (To Venice)
Tripoli
Emesa
Sidon
Damascus
Tyre
Acre
Jaffa
Jerusalem
Damietta
Gaza
Alexandria
Barka
EGYPT
Cairo
Suez
Syrian Desert
Bagdad
Kerbela
DOMINIONS OF THE SULTAN
M.-N. ENG., BUFFALO.

title upon the Spanish monarch, Francis was sorely disappointed, and during all the remainder of his reign kept up a jealous and almost incessant warfare with Charles, whose enormous possessions now nearly surrounded the French kingdom. Italy was the field of much of the fighting, as the securing of dominion in that peninsula was a chief aim of each of the rivals.[2]

What is known as the *First War* between Francis and the Emperor broke out in 1521.[3] The war was full of misfortunes for Francis. His army was driven out of Northern Italy by the imperial forces; his most skillful and trusted commander, the Constable Bourbon, turned traitor and went over to Charles; and another of his most valiant nobles, the celebrated Chevalier Bayard, the knight *sans peur et sans reproche*, "without fear and without reproach," was killed; while, to crown all, Francis, who had led a large army into Italy to retrieve his misfortunes, was, after suffering a crushing defeat at Pavia, wounded and taken prisoner (1525). In a letter to his mother informing her of the disaster, he wrote, "Nothing is left me in all the world save honor and life."[4] He was liberated by the Peace of Madrid (1526).

The most memorable incident of the *Second War* between Francis and the Emperor was the sack of Rome by an imperial army, made up chiefly of Lutherans. Rome had not witnessed such scenes since the terrible days of the Goths and Vandals.

[2] TABLE OF WARS

First War (ended by Peace of Madrid)	1521–1526	Third War (ended by Truce of Nice)	1536–1538
Second War (ended by Ladies' Peace)	1527–1529	Fourth War (ended by Peace of Crespy)	1542–1544

[3] Before beginning the war Francis cast about for an ally. The young king of England, Henry VIII, seemed the most desirable friend. He accordingly invited Henry to a conference in France, at which was to be considered the matter of an alliance against the Emperor. The two kings, each attended by a magnificent train of courtiers, met near Calais (1520). The meeting is known in history as "The Field of the Cloth of Gold," because of the prodigal richness of the costumes and appointments of the chiefs and their attendants. "Many," says a contemporary writer, "bore thither their mills, their forests, and their meadows on their backs." Nothing came of the interview, and Charles finally won Henry over to his side.

[4] From this message comes the laconic saying, "All is lost save honor."

In the *Third War* Francis shocked all Christendom by forming an alliance with the Turkish Sultan, who ravaged with his fleets the Italian coasts and sold his plunder in the port of Marseilles. Francis defended his course by saying that when wolves attacked his flock he had a right to set the dogs upon them. The tremendous outcry caused by this alliance between a Christian king and the infidel Sultan, whereas now it is thought the most natural thing in the world for Christian governments, following purely commercial or political interests alone, to become allies of the Sublime Porte, illustrates how times have changed and men with them.

The *Fourth War*, the last between the rivals, resulted in nothing decisive for either side, and the struggle was ended by the Peace of Crespy (1544).

344. Results of the Wars between Francis and Charles. — The direct and indirect consequences of the protracted combat between Francis and Charles were many and far-reaching.

First, Francis' opposition to Charles had prevented him from reducing France to a mere dependency of Spain and from crushing the political and religious liberties of Germany, and had thereby prevented him from destroying the European equilibrium and setting up on the Continent an Austro-Spanish tyranny.

Second, Protestantism had been given time to intrench itself so firmly in North Germany and in other countries as to render ineffectual all later efforts for its destruction.

Third, by preventing united action on the part of the Christian princes, and by encouraging shameful alliances between Christian and Moslem, these quarrels had really been the occasion of the severe losses which Christendom during this period suffered at the hands of the Ottoman Turks. Hungary had been ravaged with fire and sword; Rhodes had been captured and the Mediterranean made almost a Turkish lake.[5]

[5] The worst feature of this advance of the Sultan's authority in the Mediterranean was the growth, under his protection, of the power of the Algerian pirates. One of the chief strongholds of the pirates on the African coast was Tunis, which was held by the famous Barbarossa. In the interval between his second and third wars with Francis, Charles, with a large army and fleet, made an assault upon this place, defeated the corsair, and set free 20,000 Christian captives.

Fourth, these wars, having had Italy as their chief theater, had been a frightful scourge to that land and had blighted there all the fair promises of the Renaissance; but at the same time the storm had wafted the precious seeds of the revived arts and letters beyond the mountains into France and other northern lands. The French Renaissance dates from these Italian wars.

345. **Persecution of the Waldenses by Francis** (1545). — It was the religious situation that had much to do in leading Charles and Francis to compose their quarrel by the Peace of Crespy. The treaty contained secret articles in which each agreed to aid the other and to coöperate with other Catholic sovereigns in the extirpation of heresy and in the maintenance of the religious unity of Christendom. From this time on to the end of their respective reigns both were chiefly busied in carrying into effect this secret agreement.

The severest blow dealt the heretics of his kingdom by Francis fell upon the Vaudois, or Waldenses,[6] the simple, inoffensive inhabitants of a number of hamlets in the Alpine regions of Piedmont and Provence. These people during the later mediæval time had fallen into what the Church regarded as heretical ways, and just now they were mingling with their own heresies those of the Protestant reformers. Thousands were put to death by the sword, thousands more were burned at the stake. At a later time other persecutions fell upon them, until finally only a miserable remnant, who found an asylum among the mountains, were left to hand down their faith to modern times.

346. **Charles' Wars with the Protestant German Princes.** — Charles, on his part, turned his attention to the reformers in Germany. Inspired by the religious motives and convictions of which we have already spoken, and apprehensive, further, of the effect upon his authority in Germany of the growth there of such an empire within an empire as the Protestant princes and free cities — now united in a union known as the Schmalkaldic League — were becoming, he resolved to crush the whole reform movement.

[6] So called from the founder of the sect, Peter Waldo, or Pierre de Vaux, who lived in the later years of the twelfth century.

Accordingly, in the very year that Luther died (1546), the Emperor, aided by the German Catholics, attacked the Protestant league. He was at first successful, but in the end the war proved the most disastrous and humiliating to him of any in which he had engaged. Severe defeats of his armies finally constrained him to give up his undertaking to make all his German subjects think alike in matters of religion.

347. The Religious Peace of Augsburg (1555). — In the celebrated Diet of Augsburg, convened in 1555 to compose the distracted affairs of the German states, it was arranged and agreed that every prince should be allowed to choose between the Catholic religion and the Augsburg Confession,[7] and should have the right to make his religion the religion of his people.[8] This, it will be noted, was simply toleration as concerns princes or governments. The people individually had no freedom of choice; every subject must follow his prince, and think and believe as he thought and believed.

To this article, however, the Diet made one important exception. The Catholics insisted that *ecclesiastical* princes, i.e. bishops and abbots, on becoming Protestants, should give up their offices and revenues; and this important clause, under the name of the *Ecclesiastical Reservation*, was finally made a part of the treaty.

It is important that this Treaty of Augsburg should be kept carefully in mind, for the reason that it was through mutual misunderstandings of its provisions and violations of its articles by both parties that the way was paved for the terrible Thirty Years' War (Chapter XXV).

348. Charles sets up the Inquisition in the Netherlands. — In the Low Countries Charles had a freer hand in dealing with heresy than he had in Germany, since in these provinces he exercised the authority of an hereditary prince and could employ measures of repression which he could not resort to in the

[7] The Augsburg Confession, it will be recalled, was the formula of belief of the adherents of Luther (sec. 330). The Peace of Augsburg made no provision for the Calvinists (sec. 332), since there were then few of them in Germany.

[8] The free imperial cities were not given this right. Within them each party must tolerate the other.

German states. Accordingly we find him in the year 1550 setting up the Inquisition here and sustaining it with all his authority. Concerning the results of his efforts we shall speak a little farther on (sec. 399).

349. His Abdication. —While the Diet of Augsburg was arranging the religious peace, the Emperor Charles was enacting the part of a second Diocletian. There had long been forming in his mind the purpose of spending his last days in monastic seclusion. The disappointing issue of his contest with the Protestant princes of Germany, the weight of advancing years, together with menacing troubles which began "to thicken like dark clouds about the evening of his reign," now led the Emperor to carry this resolution into effect. Accordingly he abdicated in favor of his son Philip the crown of the Netherlands[9] (1555), and that of Spain and its colonies (1556), and then retired to the monastery of Yuste, situated in a secluded region in Western Spain.

The departure of the self-deposed monarch from Ghent to the place of his exile is thus contrasted, by the pen of a graceful historian, with his embarkation from the Netherlands more than a third of a century before, to receive the crown of Spain and the Indies, which had just descended to him by the death of his grandfather Ferdinand: "He was then in the morning of life; just entering on a career as splendid as ever opened to young ambition. How different must have been the reflections which now crowded on his mind, as, with wasted health, and spirits sorely depressed, he now embarked on the same voyage! He had run the race of glory, had won the prize, and found that all was vanity. He was now returning to the goal whence he had started, anxious only to reach some quiet spot where he might lay down his weary limbs and be at rest" (Prescott).

There is a tradition which tells how Charles, after vainly endeavoring to make some clocks that he had about him at Yuste

[9] Philip had received the crown of Naples the preceding year (1554), in order that his titular dignity might be the same as that of Queen Mary of England, to whom he was that year united in marriage. The imperial crown went to Charles' brother, the Archduke Ferdinand.

run together, made the following reflection: "How foolish I have been to think I could make all men believe alike about religion, when here I cannot make even two clocks keep the same time."

This story is probably mythical. Charles seems never to have doubted either the practicability or the policy of securing uniformity of belief by force. While in retirement at Yuste he expressed the deepest regret that he did not burn Luther at Worms. He was constantly urging Philip to use greater severity in dealing with his heretic subjects, and could scarcely restrain himself from leaving his retreat in order to engage personally in the work of eradicating the pestilent doctrines which he heard were spreading in Spain.

II. Spain under Philip II (1556–1598)

350. Philip's Character and his Principles of Government. — Philip, unlike his father, was a representative Spaniard. He typified and embodied in himself the traits, ideals, and aspirations of the Spanish race, just as Luther typified and embodied those of the German race. His mind was the mind, his conscience was the conscience, of the Spanish people.

Fig. 61. — Philip II. (After a painting by *Titian*)

Like the true Spaniard, Philip possessed a deeply religious nature. He believed as sincerely as ever did the Puritan Cromwell that he was God's chosen instrument for the working out of his eternal designs. But in order that he might do what God would have done in the world, he conceived it to be necessary that he should have absolute power. A necessary basis of this absolute power, in Philip's conception, as in that of his father Charles, was religious unity. Disunion in the Church meant disunion in the state. Hence one of Philip's

instruments of government was the Inquisition. He employed it in the suppression of heresy, not simply because he was a sincere Catholic and believed that heresy was willful sin and should be sternly dealt with, but primarily because heresy, in his view, was rebellion against the state.

Philip possessed unusual administrative ability. He was an incessant worker and busied himself with the endless details of government. He left nothing to the discretion of others. He did everything himself. His secretaries were mere clerks. He himself handled every dispatch. His generals awaited and followed his minute orders. He even regulated, or tried to regulate, the private affairs of his subjects, — told them how to dress, when they might use carriages, and how and where to educate their children. Under this system there was in the kingdom but one brain to plan and one will to direct. All local freedom and all individual initiative were crushed out. This fatally centralized system of absolute government Philip bequeathed to his successors, and thus contributed greatly to determine the unhappy destiny of the Spanish people.

351. **Philip's Domains and Revenues.** — With the abdication of Charles V the imperial crown passed out of the Spanish line of the House of Hapsburg. Yet the dominions of Philip were scarcely less extensive than those over which his father had ruled. All the hereditary possessions of the Spanish crown were of course his. Then just before the abdication of his father gave him these domains he had become king-consort of England by marriage with Mary Tudor; and about the middle of his reign he acquired Portugal and added to his empire its rich dependencies in Africa and the East Indies. After this accession of territory, Philip's sovereignty was owned, it has been estimated, by more than one hundred million persons, — probably as large a number as the Roman Empire contained at the time of its greatest extent.

Philip's revenues, too, were as ample as his domains. The mines of Mexico and Peru poured into the royal coffers a steady stream of the precious metals; the looms of Flanders created untold wealth for their Spanish master; while frequent and heavy

taxes levied upon the provinces and cities of the peninsula still further augmented the royal income.

But notwithstanding that Philip's dominions were so extensive, his resources so enormous, and many of the outward circumstances of his reign so striking and brilliant, there were throughout the period causes at work which were rapidly undermining the greatness of Spain and preparing her fall. By wasteful wars and extravagant buildings Philip managed to dissipate the royal treasures; and by a narrow, blind, and suicidal course in regard to his Moorish, Jewish, and Protestant subjects, he ruined the industries of the most flourishing of the provinces of Spain, and drove the Netherlands into a desperate revolt, which ended in the separation of the most valuable of those provinces from the Spanish crown.

As the most important matters of Philip's reign — namely, his war against the revolted Netherlands and his attempt upon England with his "Invincible Armada" — belong properly to the respective histories of England and the Netherlands, and will be treated of in connection with the affairs of those countries, we shall give here very little space to the history of the period.

352. **Philip's War with France.** — Philip took up his father's quarrel with France. He was aided by the English, who were persuaded to this step by their queen, Mary Tudor, now the wife, it will be recalled, of Philip. Fortune favored Philip. The French were defeated in two great battles,[10] and were forced to agree to a treaty (Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis, 1559) so advantageous to Spain as to give Philip great distinction in the eyes of all Europe.

In the negotiation of this treaty between Philip and Henry, as in the Peace of Crespy between Charles and Francis just fifteen

[10] At St. Quentin (1557), an important town in North France, then again at Gravelines (1558). The monument built by Philip to commemorate the victory of St. Quentin is strikingly illustrative of his character. Before the battle he vowed to erect to St. Lawrence the most splendid monastery the world had ever seen, if he would but give success to his arms. Philip kept his vow faithfully. A few years after the battle he laid, near the city of Madrid, the foundation of the famous Escorial, — "a palace, a monastery, and a mausoleum." The edifice was built in the form of a gridiron, from the circumstance that St. Lawrence suffered martyrdom by being broiled on such an instrument. It is the Westminster Abbey of Spain; it holds the ashes of all the Spanish sovereigns from Charles V onward.

years before, a main motive with both sovereigns was anxiety to be free to engage in the work of extirpating heresy.

353. **Philip's Crusade against the Moriscos** (1570–1571). — It will be recalled that upon the conquest of Granada in 1492 by Ferdinand and Isabella, the Moors were assured protection in all civil rights and granted religious freedom. Had these promises been kept, the Moors, docile and industrious as they were, would have become loyal subjects of the Spanish crown, and an element of strength in the Spanish nation.

But the Emperor Charles V had broken faith with them. Carrying out his policy of enforcing religious uniformity, he compelled them to embrace Christianity. They submitted to baptism, and outwardly conformed to the requirements of the Church, but secretly they held to their own faith, and maintained their ancient practices and traditions. Having been baptized, however, they were subject to the jurisdiction of the Church. The Inquisition dealt cruelly with them as apostates and heretics.

Philip inherited the policy of his father, and was more thoroughgoing in carrying it out. He conceived it to be his duty to impose upon the Moriscos — thus they were called after their conversion — conditions that should thoroughly obliterate all traces of their ancient faith and manners. So he issued a decree that they should no longer wear their native garb or use their native tongue, and that they should give their children Christian names and send them to Christian schools. A determined revolt followed.

The uprising was suppressed with cruel severity, and then, because there was danger that if left in these coast regions they might open the gates of the country to the Moslems of the Mediterranean, an order was issued which condemned all the Moriscos of Granada to deportation to districts in the center and the north of the peninsula. The order was relentlessly carried out. Men, women, and children, all who were of Moorish blood, were carried off into hopeless exile.

354. **Defeat of the Turkish Fleet at Lepanto** (1571). — At the very moment almost that Philip was dealing Spain a fatal blow by his cruel treatment of his Morisco subjects, he was rendering a great

service to Christian civilization at large. This he did by helping to stay the progress of the Ottoman Turks in the Mediterranean. They had captured the important island of Cyprus, and had assaulted the Hospitalers at Malta, which island had been saved from falling into the hands of the infidels only by the splendid conduct of the Knights. All Christendom was becoming alarmed. An alliance was formed, embracing the Pope, the Venetians, and Philip II. An immense fleet was equipped and put under the command of Don John of Austria, Philip's half-brother, a young general whose consummate ability had been recently displayed in the crusade against the Moors.

The Christian fleet met the Turkish squadron in the Gulf of Lepanto, on the western coast of Greece. The battle was unequaled by anything the Mediterranean had seen since the naval encounters of the Romans and Carthaginians in the First Punic War. The Ottoman fleet was almost totally destroyed. Thousands of Christian captives, who were found chained to the oars of the Turkish galleys, were liberated. All Christendom rejoiced as when Jerusalem was captured by the first crusaders.

The battle of Lepanto holds an important place in history, because it marks the turning point of the long struggle between the Mohammedans and Christians, which had now been going on for nearly one thousand years. Though the Moslems had received many checks, there really was no time previous to this great victory when the Mohammedan power, represented first by the Arabs and afterwards by the Turks, did not hang like a threatening cloud along the southern or eastern border of Christendom. The victory of Lepanto robbed the cloud of its terrors. The Ottoman Turks, though they afterwards made progress in some quarters, never recovered the prestige they lost in that disaster, and their power thenceforward steadily declined.

355. **The Acquisition of Portugal by Spain.** — When in 1580 the throne of Portugal became vacant by the death of Dom Henry the Cardinal, Philip laid claim to the kingdom, and sent an army, led by the able Duke of Alva, to take possession of the country. For sixty years Portugal remained in captivity to Spain.

The significance of this acquisition consisted not so much in the extension of Spanish authority throughout the peninsula as in the bringing under Spanish control of the colonial possessions of Portugal in South America, in Africa, and in the East Indies, for this soon made them the spoil of the Dutch and the English, the enemies and the commercial rivals of Spain. It was under these circumstances that the Dutch, seizing the Spice Islands and other former possessions of Portugal, laid the basis of their great empire in the Eastern seas, and the English that of theirs in India.

356. The Death of Philip (1598). — In the year 1588 Philip made his memorable attempt with the so-called "Invincible Armada" upon England, at this time the stronghold of Protestantism. As we shall see a little later, he failed utterly in the undertaking. Ten years after this death ended his reign.

Of the character of Philip probably no juster estimate has ever been made than that found in these words of the Dutch historian Blok: "Not until our time has it been made clear that in the heart of this politician, full of political cunning, of devilish revenge, of low craft, — in the heart of this little-spirited, narrow, somber, bitter king, — there were also world-wide thoughts, noble feelings of belief, hearty love, rich artistic feeling, and devotion to higher ideals."

357. Later Events: the Expulsion of the Moriscos (1609–1610); **Loss of the Netherlands.** — From the death of Philip II Spain declined in power, reputation, and influence. This was due very largely to the bigotry and tyranny of her rulers. Thus under Philip III (1598–1621) a severe loss, one from which they never recovered, was inflicted upon the manufactures and other industries of the country by the expulsion of the Moriscos.

Philip II, it will be recalled, had deported the whole Morisco population of Granada to inland provinces. Now all Spain was to be cleared absolutely of the "evil race." Not one was to be left upon Spanish soil. Philip really believed that this driving out of the misbelievers would be a service pleasing to God, even as was the driving out by the Hebrews of the Canaanites from Palestine. But he was actuated also by other motives in expelling the

unhappy Moriscos. They were accused, and not without ground, so desperate had oppression and persecution rendered them, of plotting with their co-religionists, the African Moors and the Ottoman Turks, for the invasion of Spain, and thus endangering the peace and unity of the land.

Accordingly during the years 1609 and 1610 all persons of Moorish descent — more than half a million of the most intelligent, skillful, and industrious inhabitants of the peninsula — were driven into exile, chiefly to North Africa. The empty dwellings and neglected fields of once populous and gardenlike provinces told how fatal a blow Spain had inflicted upon herself. She had achieved religious unity — but at a great price.

At the very moment that Spain was being so deeply wounded in the peninsula she received an incurable hurt in her outside possessions. In the Truce of 1609 (sec. 412) she was forced virtually to recognize the independence of the Protestant Netherlands, whose revolt against the tyranny of Philip II has been mentioned. In the secession of these provinces Spain lost her most valuable dependency.

358. **Conclusion.** — Spain now disappears as a power of the first rank from the stage of history. The historian Laurent finely compares her withdrawal from the theater of great affairs to Charles V's retirement into the cloistral solitude of Yuste. "In the sixteenth century," he says, "Spain shone in the first rank among the great powers; she filled the Old and the New World with her name; then she retired into isolation, as Charles V at the end of his agitated life retired within the solitude of a monastery."

Even the very brief review which we have made of her sixteenth-century history will not fail to have revealed at least two of the main causes of her failure and quick decadence: first, a false imperial policy in Europe which involved her in endless and fruitless wars; and second, political despotism and religious intolerance.

Selections from the Sources. — *Translations and Reprints*, vol. iii. No. 3, "Period of the Later Reformation" (ed. by Merrick Whitcomb); contains short selections bearing on several of the matters covered by this chapter.

See BREWER, *Reign of Henry VIII*, vol. ii, pp. 120–126, for accounts by eyewitnesses of the sack of Rome by the imperial army in 1527.

Secondary Works. — ROBERTSON, *History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles the Fifth*. PRESCOTT, *History of the Reign of Philip the Second;* this and the preceding work by Robertson are reckoned among the classics of historical literature. ARMSTRONG, *The Emperor Charles* V. STIRLING-MAXWELL, *The Cloister Life of the Emperor Charles the Fifth*, and *Don John of Austria;* works combining in a rare degree great learning and literary charm. HUME, *The Spanish People*, chaps. ix–xi; *Spain: its Greatness and Decay*, and *Philip II of Spain*. All these are works by an eminent scholar, and are well adapted to use with classes of young readers. LEA, *The Moriscos of Spain: their Conversion and Expulsion*. STEPHENS, *Portugal*, chap. xiii; for Portugal's "Sixty Years' Captivity" to Spain. See also bibliography for Chapter XXIII.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The Field of the Cloth of Gold. 2. Siege of Vienna by the Ottoman Turks (1529). 3. The sack of Rome in 1527. 4. The Waldenses. 5. The Emperor Charles V at Yuste. 6. The Escorial. 7. The Expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain.

CHAPTER XXII

THE TUDORS AND THE ENGLISH REFORMATION
(1485–1603)

I. Introductory

359. The Tudor Period. — The Tudor period[1] in English history covers the sixteenth century, and overlaps a little the preceding century and also the following. It was an eventful and stirring time for the English people. It witnessed among them great progress in art, science, and trade, and a literary outburst such as the world had not seen since the best days of Athens. But the great event of the period was the Reformation. It was under the sovereigns of this house that England was severed from papal Rome, and Protestantism became firmly established in the island. To tell how these great results were effected will be our chief aim in the present chapter.

360. The English Reformation first a Revolt and then a Reform; its Premonitions. — The Reformation in England was, more distinctly than elsewhere, a double movement. First, England was separated violently from the ecclesiastical empire of Rome, but without any essential change being made in creed or form of worship. This was accomplished under Henry VIII.

Second, the English Church, thus rendered independent of Rome, gradually changed its creed and ritual. This was effected chiefly under Edward VI. So the movement was first a *revolt* and then a *reform*.

In so far as it was a secession movement, it was practically merely the culmination of an age-long controversy between England

[1] The Tudor sovereigns were Henry VII (1485–1509), Henry VIII (1509–1547), Edward VI (1547–1553), Mary (1553–1558), and Elizabeth (1558–1603).

and the Papacy.[2] "For three hundred years," in the words of the historian Green, "the Pope had been the standing grievance of Englishmen." Time and again the English Parliament had passed acts declaring that the Pope should not do this and should not do that in England. It was this sensitiveness of Englishmen respecting the jurisdiction in England of a foreign potentate that made it so comparatively easy for Henry VIII, during the first stir and excitement of the reform movement, to cut England loose from the papal empire.

In so far as the movement was a religious reformation, the soil in England had been in a measure prepared for the seed of the reformed faith by the labors of the humanists. We have already spoken of the significant movement of the Oxford reformers, Colet, Erasmus, and More (sec. 317).

II. The Reign of Henry VII (1485–1509)

361. Benevolences; the Statute of Liveries. — Henry VII and his queen united the long-disputed titles of the two Roses (sec. 223). But the bitter feelings engendered by the contentions of the rival families still existed. Particularly was there much smothered discontent among the Yorkists, which manifested itself in two remarkable attempts to place impostors upon the throne, both of which however were unsuccessful.

Henry's besetting sins were avarice and a love of despotic rule. Much of his attention was given to heaping up a vast treasure, which he left to his successor. One device adopted by the king for wringing money from his wealthy subjects was what were euphemistically termed "Benevolences." Magna Carta forbade the king to impose taxes without the consent of the Common Council. But Henry did not like to convene Parliament, as he wished to rule like the kings of the Continent, guided simply by his own free will. So benevolences were made to take the place of regular

[2] For episodes in this protracted quarrel, see "The Martyrdom of Thomas Becket" (sec. 208), "Pope Innocent III and King John of England" (sec. 164), and "The Revolt of Germany and England" (sec. 169).

taxes. These were nothing more nor less than gifts extorted from the well-to-do by moral pressure.

One of Henry's favorite ministers, Cardinal Morton, was particularly successful in his appeals for gifts of this kind. To those who lived splendidly he would say that it was very evident they were quite able to make a generous donation to their sovereign; while to others who lived in a narrow and pinched way he would represent that their economical mode of life must have made them wealthy. This teasing dilemma received the name of "Morton's fork."

The king found still another source of revenue in raking up long-forgotten claims of the crown, and in imposing fines for the violation of musty laws that everybody had forgotten. Among the various laws executed with unusual rigor, not more to sustain the dignity of the crown than to increase its revenues, was one known as the Statute of Liveries, which forbade the great lords to keep liveried or uniformed retainers. This statute was intended to take away from the baronage what little power and importance remained to them after the ruin wrought by the Wars of the Roses. Henry watched this matter very closely, and greatly increased the receipts of the royal exchequer by the enforcement of fines.

362. **Foreign Matrimonial Alliances.** — The marriages of Henry's children must be noted by us here, because of the great influence these alliances had upon the after course of English history.

A common fear of France caused Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain and Henry to form a protective alliance. To secure the permanency of the union it was deemed necessary to cement it by a marriage bond. The Infanta Catherine was accordingly betrothed to Arthur, Prince of Wales. Unfortunately, the prince died soon after the celebration of the nuptials.

The Spanish sovereigns, still anxious to retain the advantages of an English alliance, now urged that the young widow be espoused by Arthur's brother Henry. A rule of the Church, however, which forbade a man to marry his brother's widow, stood in the way of this arrangement; but the queen mother Isabella secured from Pope Julius II a decree granting permission in this

case, and so the young widow was betrothed to Prince Henry. This alliance of the royal families of England and Spain led to many important consequences, as we shall learn.

To relieve England of danger on her northern frontier, Henry steadily pursued the policy of a marriage alliance with Scotland. His wishes were realized when his elder daughter Margaret became the wife of James IV, king of that realm. This was a most fortunate marriage, and finally led to the happy union of the two countries under a single crown.

363. **Maritime Discoveries.** — It was during this reign that great geographical discoveries enlarged the boundaries of the world. Columbus announced to Europe the existence of land to the west; Vasco da Gama sailed around the Cape of Good Hope and found a water path to the East Indies.

In the year of this last enterprise Henry commissioned John Cabot, a Venetian navigator doing business in England, and his sons to make explorations in the western and northern seas. In his westward voyage Cabot ran against the American continent somewhere in the vicinity of Newfoundland, and took possession of the country in the name of the English sovereign (1497). He was probably the first European to look upon the mainland of the New World, for Columbus up to this time had seen only the islands of the Gulf of Mexico and of the Caribbean Sea.

Upon this discovery and other alleged discoveries and explorations of John Cabot and his son Sebastian the English based their claim to the whole of the American coast from Labrador down to Florida. This claim included the best part of North America, — what was destined to be the third and most spacious home of the Anglo-Saxon race.

III. England severed from the Papacy by Henry VIII (1509–1547)

364. **Cardinal Wolsey.** — Henry VII died in 1509, leaving his throne to his son Henry, an energetic and headstrong youth of eighteen years. We must here at the opening of the young king's

reign[3] introduce his greatest minister, Thomas Wolsey (1475?–1530). This man was one of the most remarkable characters of his generation, — "probably the greatest political genius," says Bishop Creighton, "whom England has ever produced." He was, as Holinshed characterizes him, "very eloquent, and full of wit; but passingly ambitious." Henry elevated him to the office of Archbishop of York, and made him Lord Chancellor of the realm; the Pope made him a cardinal, and afterwards papal legate in England. He was now virtually at the head of affairs in both State and Church.

Wolsey was a patriot, — the best patriot of his time. But he conceived the great need of England, still feeling the effects of the old feudal turbulency, to be a single, strong, firm hand at the helm; hence his first aim was to make the royal power supreme and absolute. His second aim was to make England the center of European politics, the mediator between the rival powers of France, Spain, and the Papacy. He attained in a fair measure both these ends; he enabled Henry to rule as well as to reign, and secured for England great prestige in Europe.

365. Henry as "Defender of the Faith." — It was in the eighth year of Henry VIII's reign that Martin Luther tacked upon the door of the Wittenberg church his famous ninety-five theses. England was stirred with the rest of Western Christendom. When, a little later, Luther attacked directly the papal power, Henry wrote a Latin treatise refuting the arguments of the audacious monk.

The Pope, Leo X, rewarded Henry's Catholic zeal by conferring upon him the title of "Defender of the Faith" (1521). This title was retained by Henry after the secession of the Church of England from the papal see, and is borne by his latest successor

[3] In 1512, joining what was known as the Holy League, — a union against the French king, of which the Pope was the head, — Henry made his first campaign in France. While Henry was across the Channel, James IV of Scotland thought to give aid to the French king by invading England. The Scottish army was met by the English force at Flodden, beneath the Cheviot Hills, and completely overwhelmed (1513). King James was killed, and the flower of the Scottish nobility was left dead upon the field. It was the most terrible disaster that had ever befallen the Scottish nation. Scott's poem *Marmion, a Tale of Flodden Field*, commemorates the battle.

to-day, although he is "defender" of quite a different faith from that in the defense of which Henry first earned the title.

366. **Henry seeks to be divorced from Catherine.**—We have now to relate some circumstances which very soon changed Henry from a zealous supporter of the Papacy into a bitter enemy. Henry's marriage with Catherine of Aragon had been prompted

FIG. 62.—HENRY VIII. (After a painting by *Holbein*)

by policy and not by love. Of the five children born of the union, all had died save a sickly daughter named Mary. In these successive afflictions which left him without a son to succeed him, Henry saw or feigned to see a sign of Heaven's displeasure because he had taken to wife the widow of his brother. And now a new circumstance arose, if it had not existed for some time previous to this. Henry fell in love with Anne Boleyn, a beautiful and vivacious maid of honor in the queen's household. This new affection so greatly quickened the king's conscience that he

soon became fully convinced that it was his duty to put Catherine aside. Accordingly Henry asked the Pope, Clement VII, to grant him a divorce. Clement gave no immediate decision, but after about two years' delay, influenced by the Emperor Charles, he ordered Henry and Catherine both to appear before him at Rome.

367. The Fall of Wolsey; his Death (1530). — Henry's patience was now completely exhausted. Becoming persuaded that Wolsey was not exerting himself as he might to secure the divorce, he banished him from court. The hatred of Anne Boleyn and of others, for Wolsey had many enemies, pursued the fallen minister. Finally, he was arrested on the preposterous charge of high treason. While on his way to London the unhappy minister, broken in spirit and in health, was prostrated by a fatal fever. As he lay dying in the arms of the kind monks of Leicester Abbey, he uttered these self-censuring words: "Had I served my God as diligently as I have served my king, He would not have given me over in my gray hairs."

Wolsey had indeed sunk his priestly office in that of the statesman, and as a statesman he had often stifled the scruples of conscience in obedience to the king's unholy wishes and commands.

368. The Opinion of the Universities. — Just before Wolsey's disgrace a young priest of Cambridge, named Thomas Cranmer, had suggested that the universities in England and upon the Continent should be asked to give their opinion on the validity of the king's marriage with Catherine. If they all agreed that the union was invalid, then the Pope could hardly refuse to grant the divorce. The plan pleased Henry, and to the universities, accordingly, the case was submitted. But the opinions of the learned doctors were so conflicting, and, especially in the case of the English universities, so manifestly tainted with bribery, that nothing save delay resulted from this plan of settlement.

369. Thomas Cromwell. — A man of great power and mark now rises to our notice. After the disgrace of Wolsey an attendant of his named Thomas Cromwell rapidly assumed in Henry's regard the place from which the cardinal had fallen. For the space of ten years this strong but unscrupulous man shaped the policy

of Henry's government. What he proposed to himself was the establishment of a royal despotism upon the ruin of every other power in the state. Man of iron will that he was, Cromwell pursued his aims with such terrible relentlessness that the period during which his power was supreme has been called the English Reign of Terror. The executioner's ax was often wet with the blood of those who stood in his way, or who in any manner incurred his or the king's displeasure.

It was to the bold suggestions of this man that Henry now listened. Cromwell's advice to the king was to waste no more time in negotiating with the Pope, but at once to renounce the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, proclaim himself supreme head of the Church in England, and then get a decree of divorce from his own courts.

370. First Acts in the Breach with Rome (1533–1534). — The advice of Cromwell was acted upon, and by a series of steps England was swiftly carried out from under the authority of the Roman see. Henry first virtually cut the Gordian knot by a secret marriage with Anne Boleyn, notwithstanding a papal decree threatening him with excommunication should he dare to do so.

Parliament, which was entirely subservient to Henry's wishes, now passed a law known as the Act in Restraint of Appeals (1533), which made it a crime for any Englishman to carry a case out of the realm to the court of Rome. This was to prevent Catherine from appealing to the Pope from any decision which might be rendered in her case by an English tribunal.

Cranmer, the Cambridge doctor who had advised the king to submit the question of the validity of his union with Catherine to the universities, and who had further served him by writing a book in favor of the divorce, had, in accordance with the new programme, been made Archbishop of Canterbury. He now formed a court, tried the case, and of course declared the king's marriage with Catherine null and void.

The following year (1534) Henry procured from Parliament the passage of the important Act of Annates, which forbade absolutely the payment to Rome of the first fruits of archbishoprics

and bishoprics, and ordered that these should henceforth be paid to the English crown.

371. **The Act of Supremacy** (1534). — At Rome the acts of Henry and his Parliament were denounced as acts of impious usurpation. The Pope issued a bull excommunicating Henry and relieving his subjects from their allegiance.

Henry now took the final and decisive step. He got from Parliament the celebrated Act of Supremacy (1534). This statute made Henry "the only Supreme Head in earth of the Church of England," vesting in him absolute control of its offices and affairs and turning into his hands the revenue which had hitherto flowed into Rome's treasury. A denial of the title given the king by the statute was made high treason.

Such a break with the past met of course with much disapproval, and many persons were put to death under the statute. The most illustrious victims of this tyranny were John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, who for several years was one of Henry's chief councilors. Both were sent to the block (in 1535) because they refused to admit the validity of Henry's divorce from Catherine and to acknowledge the royal supremacy in religious matters. The execution of Thomas More particularly created widespread condemnation and dismay. When the Emperor Charles V heard what Henry had done, he is reported to have said that he would rather have lost the best city in his empire than such a councilor; and Erasmus wrote to a friend, "What a man has England and what a friend have I lost!"

372. **The Suppression of the Monasteries** (1536–1539). — The suppression of the monasteries was one of Henry's early acts as the supreme head of the Church of England. He resolved upon the destruction of the religious houses because, in the first place, he coveted their wealth, which at this time included probably one fifth of the lands of the realm. Further, the monastic orders were openly or secretly opposed to Henry's claims of supremacy in religious matters; and this naturally caused him to regard them with jealousy and disfavor. This was another reason with him for compassing their ruin.

In order to make the act appear as reasonable as possible, it was planned to make the charge of immorality its ostensible ground. Accordingly two royal commissioners were appointed to inspect the monasteries and make a report upon what they might see and learn. If we may believe the report, the smaller houses were conducted in a most shameful manner. The larger houses, however, were fairly free from faults. Many of them served as schools, hospitals, and inns, and all distributed alms to the poor who knocked at their gates.

But the undoubted usefulness and irreproachable character of these larger foundations did not avail to avert ruin from them also. During the years 1537 to 1539 all were dissolved, their possessors generally surrendering the property voluntarily into the hands of the king lest a worse thing than the loss of their houses should come upon them. By an act of Parliament in 1539 all monastic property was given to the crown.

Altogether there were six hundred and forty-five monasteries broken up. The monastic buildings were generally dismantled, every scrap of iron or lead being torn from them, and their unprotected walls left to sink into picturesque ivy-clad ruins. Small pensions were granted to the dispossessed monks, which relieved in a measure the suffering and hardship caused by the proceeding.

The destruction of the monasteries was a signal for the desecration and pillage of the sacred relics, images, and shrines with which the land was crowded. The destruction of the famous pilgrim shrine of Thomas Becket at Canterbury (sec. 208) is a typical case. The saint, because he had upheld the supremacy of the Pope against King Henry II, was solemnly tried for treason and declared a traitor. His bones were then dragged from their receptacle and burned, and the rich adornments and offerings of the shrine — great cart loads of jewels and other costly things, probably the real secret of Henry's wrath against the saint — were confiscated to the royal use (1538).

A portion of the vast wealth which came into Henry's hands through all these confiscations was used in founding schools and colleges and in establishing new bishoprics, and a part was devoted

to other public purposes; but by far the greater portion of the landed property was sold at merely nominal prices or given outright to the favorites of the king. Many of the leading English families of to-day trace the titles of their estates from these confiscated lands of the religious houses. Thus a new aristocracy was raised up whose interests led them to oppose any return to Rome; for in such an event their estates were liable, of course, to be restored to the monasteries.

373. **Effects upon Parliament of the Suppression of the Monasteries.** — The effects of the dissolution of the monasteries upon the Upper House of Parliament were, for the time being, most disastrous to the cause of English constitutional liberty. The House of Lords had hitherto often been a check upon the royal power. By the destruction of the religious houses that branch of Parliament, already greatly reduced in strength by the decay of the temporal peerage, was still further weakened through the casting out of the abbots and priors who held seats in that chamber.[4] At the same time the spiritual lords who were left, that is the two archbishops and the bishops, became mere dependents of the king, whom the Act of Supremacy had made head of the English Church without any superior on earth.

Thus did the House of Lords almost cease to be a body with a mind and will of its own. Since the House of Commons contained many servile nominees of the king, the English government now became something like an absolute monarchy.

374. **Act to secure Uniformity of Belief** (1539). — In the same year that Parliament gave into Henry's hands the last of the property of the monastic orders, it passed a bill drawn in conformity with his views and called an Act for abolishing Diversity of Opinions. By this statute the teachings of the old Church respecting the real presence in the Eucharist, the celibacy of the priesthood, private Masses, confession to a priest, and other tenets were approved as agreeable to the laws of God, and it was made a crime for any person to hold, to teach, or to practice opinions opposed to any of these dogmas.

[4] Twenty-six abbots and two priors were expelled.

PLATE VI. — RUINS OF FOUNTAINS ABBEY, YORKSHIRE, ENGLAND. (From a photograph)

"The monastic buildings were generally dismantled, every scrap of iron and lead being torn from them, and the unprotected walls left to sink into picturesque, ivy-clad ruins"

What the Church of England should be called under Henry it would be hard to say. It was not Protestant; and it was just as far from being truly Catholic. That it was distinctively neither the one nor the other is shown by the character of the persecutions that took place. Catholics and Protestants alike were harassed and put to death. Thus on one occasion three Catholics who denied that the king was the rightful head of the Church and three Protestants who disputed the doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist were dragged on the same sled to the place of execution.

375. **Henry's Wives.** — Henry's troubles with his wives form a curious and shameful page in the history of England's kings. Anne Boleyn retained the affections of her royal husband only a few months. She was charged with unfaithfulness and beheaded, leaving a daughter, who became the famous Queen Elizabeth. The day after the execution of Anne the king married Jane Seymour, who died the following year. She left a son by the name of Edward.

The fourth marriage of the king was to Anne of Cleves, who enjoyed her queenly honors only a few months.[5] The king becoming enamored of a young lady named Catherine Howard, Anne was divorced on the charge of a previous betrothal, and a new alliance formed. But Catherine was proved guilty of misconduct before her marriage, and her head fell upon the block. The sixth and last wife of this amatory monarch was Catherine Parr. She was a discreet woman, and managed to outlive her husband.

376. **Henry's Death and Character; his Work.** — Henry died in 1547. Very diverse views have been held of his character. He was admittedly meddlesome, cruel, arbitrary, and selfish.

[5] Thomas Cromwell had arranged this marriage; because it had proved so unsatisfactory to Henry, he withdrew his favor from him, and very soon, on the charge of his having taken bribes and of other misconduct, sent him to the block (1540). In this, as in similar cases, the king acted under the forms of law. He secured from the subservient Parliament a bill of attainder, which is an act passed like an ordinary statute. Before Cromwell's time, the accused had a right to be heard in his own defense. But Cromwell, to please his master, had brought it about that Parliament could venture to condemn a person without a hearing. It was poetic justice that made Cromwell himself a victim of this instrument of tyranny. Because of the misuse by the English Parliament of this power, the framers of the Constitution of the United States, in enumerating the powers of Congress, inserted this clause: "No bill of attainder . . . shall be passed."

Even if the English people are indebted to him for their national independent Church, still they owe him for this no gratitude; for what he did here proceeded primarily from the most ignoble impulses and motives, and not from regard for the spiritual welfare of his subjects or from sympathy with religious reform.

In another sphere, however, Henry accomplished a work which entitles him to the grateful remembrance of a people who pride themselves on their mastery of the sea. He had the vision to discern that England's dominion must be sought not on the European Continent but on the ocean. Hence he took a deep interest in naval affairs. At a time when the continental sovereigns were creating standing armies, he, as it has been put, created for England a "standing navy." He brought to perfection the sailing war ship, and gave it precedence over the oared vessel, which up to this time had held the chief place in the world's war navies. Thus under Henry the English navy, in the words of an eminent naval authority, "was becoming an entirely new thing, a thing the world had never seen before." The change was somewhat like that effected when the steamship replaced the sailing vessel.

FIG. 63. — SIR THOMAS MORE
(After the painting by *Holbein*)

377. Literature under Henry VIII; More's *Utopia*. — The most prominent literary figure of this period is Sir Thomas More. The work upon which his fame as a writer mainly rests is his *Utopia*, or "Nowhere," a romance like Plato's *Republic* or Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*. It pictures an imaginary kingdom away on an island in the New World, then just discovered, where the laws, manners, and customs of the people were represented as being ideally perfect. It was the wretchedness of the lower classes, the religious intolerance, the despotic government of the times which

inspired the *Utopia*. The great mass of the people were living in miserable mud hovels, like those of the Irish tenants of to-day. Society was simply "a conspiracy of the rich against the poor." The government of Henry and his ministers resembled an Oriental tyranny.

It was this state of things that forced from the sensitive soul of More this complaint. "No such cry of pity for the poor," says Green, "had been heard since the days of Piers Plowman." But More's was not simply such a cry of despair as was that of Langland. He saw a better future; and with a view of reforming them, pointed out the existing ills of society. He did this by telling how things were in "Nowhere," — how the houses and grounds were all inviting, the streets broad and clean; how everybody was taught to read and write, and no one obliged to work more than six hours a day; how drinking houses, brawls, and wars were unknown; how the criminal classes were treated with the view of effecting their reformation; how in this happy republic every person had a part in the government, and was allowed to follow what religion he chose.

In this wise way More suggested improvements in social, political, and religious matters. He did not expect, however, that Henry would follow all his suggestions, — indeed, More himself, before his death, materially changed his views regarding religious toleration, — for he closes his account of the Utopians with this admission: "I confess that many things in the commonwealth of Utopia I rather *wish* than *hope* to see adopted in our own."

IV. Changes in Creed and Ritual under Edward VI (1547–1553)

378. Events at the Accession. — In accordance with the provisions of a Succession Act passed in Henry's reign, his only son, Edward, by Jane Seymour, succeeded him. As Edward was but a mere child of nine years, the government was conducted by a council of regency, made up both of reformers and Catholics; but the reformers usurped authority in the body and conducted the government in the interest of their party.

The young king was carefully taught the doctrines of the reformers, and many changes were made in the creed and service of the English Church, which carried it farther away from the Church of Rome. It is these changes in the religion that constitute the events most worthy of our attention.

379. **Changes in the Religion.** — Under the new régime all pictures and images and crosses were cleared from the churches; the frescoes were covered with whitewash, and the stained-glass windows were broken in pieces; the robe and the surplice were cast away; the use of tapers, holy water, and incense was discontinued; the veneration of the Virgin and the keeping of saints' days were prohibited; belief in purgatory was denounced as a vain superstition kept up for purposes of gain, and prayers for the dead were interdicted; the real or bodily presence of Christ in the bread and wine of the sacrament was denied; the prohibition against the marriage of the clergy was annulled; and the services of the Church, which hitherto — save as to some portion of them during the last three years of Henry's reign — had been conducted in Latin, were ordered to be said in the language of the people.

In order that the provision last mentioned might be effectually carried out, the *English Book of Common Prayer* was prepared by Archbishop Cranmer, and the first copy issued in 1549. This book, which was in the main simply a translation of the old Latin *Missal* and *Breviary*, with the subsequent change of a word here and a passage there to keep it in accord with the growing new doctrines, is the same that is used in the Anglican Church at the present time.

In 1552 were published the famous Forty-two Articles of Religion, which formed a compendious creed of the reformed faith. These articles, reduced finally to thirty-nine, form the present standard of faith and doctrine in the Church of England.

380. **Persecutions to secure Uniformity.** — These sweeping changes and innovations in the old creed and in the services of the Church would have worked little hardship or wrong had only everybody, as in More's happy republic, been left free to favor and follow what religion he would. But unfortunately it was only

away in "Nowhere" that men were allowed perfect freedom of conscience and worship. The idea of toleration had not yet dawned upon the world, save in the happier moments of some such generous and wide-horizoned soul as his that conceived the *Utopia*.

By royal edict all preachers and teachers were forced to sign the Forty-two Articles; and severe laws, known as Acts for the Uniformity of Service, punished with severe penalties any departure from the forms of the new prayer book. Even the Princess Mary, who remained a conscientious adherent of the old faith, was harassed and persecuted because she would have the Catholic service in her own private chapel.

Many persons during the reign were imprisoned for refusing to conform to the new worship; while two at least were given to the flames as "heretics and contemners of the Book of Common Prayer." Probably a large majority of the English people were at this time still good Catholics at heart.

V. Reaction under Mary (1553–1558)

381. Accession of Mary; her Marriage to Philip of Spain. — Upon the death of Edward an attempt was made, in the interest of the Protestant party, to place upon the throne Lady Jane Grey, a grandniece of Henry VIII; but the people, knowing that Mary was the rightful heir to the throne, rallied about her, and she was proclaimed queen amidst great demonstrations of loyalty. Soon after her accession she was married to Philip II of Spain.

This marriage had been planned by Philip's father, the Emperor Charles V, in the hope that thereby England might become actually or in effect a part of the Spanish empire. Had the marriage worked out in this way and England been secured as an ally of the papal party in the great combat between Catholicism and Protestantism, the issue of the struggle might have been very different from what it was.

382. Reconciliation with Rome (1554). — The majority of the English prelates had never in their hearts approved the recent ecclesiastical changes. Their zeal for the ancient Church, allied

with Mary's, now quickly brought about the full reëstablishment of the Catholic worship throughout the realm. Parliament voted that the nation should return to its obedience to the papal see; and then the members of both Houses fell upon their knees to receive at the hands of the papal legate absolution from the sin of heresy and schism. The sincerity of their repentance was attested by their repeal of all the acts by which the new worship had been set up in the land. The joy at Rome was unbounded. The prodigal had returned to his father's house.

But not quite everything done by the reformers was undone. Parliament refused to restore the confiscated Church lands, which was very natural, as much of this property was now in the hands of the lords and commoners. Mary, however, in her zeal for the ancient faith, restored a great part of the property still in the possession of the crown, and refounded many of the ruined monasteries and abbeys.

383. **The Martyrs: Latimer and Ridley (1555), and Cranmer (1556).** — With the reëstablishment of the Catholic worship, the Protestants in their turn were subjected to persecution. Altogether, between two and three hundred persons suffered death during this reign on account of their religion. The three most eminent martyrs were Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer. Latimer and Ridley were burned at the same stake. As the torch was applied to the fagots, the aged Latimer — he was seventy years old — encouraged his companion with these memorable words: "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day, by God's grace, light such a candle in England as I trust shall never be put out."

Mary should not be judged harshly for the part she took in the persecutions that disfigured her reign. It was not her fault, but the fault of the age, that these things were done. Punishment of heresy was then regarded, by almost all Catholics and Protestants alike, as a duty which could be neglected by those in authority only at the peril of Heaven's displeasure.

384. **The Loss of Calais (1558).** — The marriage of Philip and Mary had been earnestly wished for by the Emperor Charles V,

in order that Philip, in those wars with France which he well knew must be a part of the legacy he should transmit to his son, might have the powerful aid of England. This was Philip's chief reason for seeking the alliance, and in due time he called upon Mary for assistance in a war against the French king. The English people were very reluctant to take any part in the quarrel; but Mary's council at last yielded to her urgent solicitations, and aid was extended to Philip. The result was the mortifying loss to England of Calais, which the French, by an unexpected attack, snatched out of the hands of its garrison (1558).

VI. Final Establishment of Protestantism under Elizabeth (1558–1603)

385. **The Queen.** — Elizabeth, who was twenty-five years of age when the death of Mary called her to the throne, was the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. She seems to have inherited the characteristics of both parents; hence perhaps the inconsistencies of her disposition. She possessed a masculine intellect, a strong will, admirable judgment, and great political tact. It was these qualities which rendered her reign the strongest and most illustrious in the record of England's sovereigns, and raised the nation from a position of comparative insignificance to a foremost place among the states of Europe.

Along with her good and queenly qualities and accomplishments, Elizabeth had many unamiable traits and unwomanly ways. She was capricious, treacherous, unscrupulous, and ungrateful. Deception and falsehood were her usual weapons in diplomacy. "In the profusion and recklessness of her lies," declares Green, "Elizabeth stood without a peer in Christendom."

Yet, notwithstanding all the faults of this remarkable woman, she was always popular with her subjects, and this largely for the same reason that Philip II was popular in Spain, — because she was in perfect sympathy with her people and represented their ideals and aspirations. Her subjects' strong liking is embalmed in the familiar title they bestowed upon her, — "Good Queen Bess."

Elizabeth never married, notwithstanding Parliament was constantly urging her to do so, and suitors, among whom was Philip II of Spain, were as numerous as those who sought the hand of Penelope. She declared — very late in her reign, however — that on her coronation day she was married to the English realm, and that she would have no other husband. She remained to the end the "fair Vestal throned by the West."

FIG 64. — QUEEN ELIZABETH. (The Ermine Portrait, from the collection of the Marquis of Salisbury, Hatfield House)

386. Her Ministers. — One secret of the strength and popularity of Elizabeth's government was the admirable judgment she exercised in her choice of advisers. The courtiers with whom she crowded her receptions might be frivolous persons; but about her council board she gathered the wisest and strongest men of the realm. And yet Elizabeth's government was really her own. We now know that her advisers did not have as much to do with shaping the policies of the reign as was formerly believed.

The most eminent of the queen's ministers was Sir William Cecil (Lord Burghley), a man of great sagacity and ceaseless

industry, and a vigilant and prudent administrator. He stood at the head of the queen's council for forty years. His son Robert, Sir Nicholas Bacon, and Sir Francis Walsingham were also prominent among the queen's advisers.

387. **Reëstablishment of the Reformed Church.** — As Mary undid the work in religion of Henry and Edward, so now her work was undone by Elizabeth. Elizabeth favored the reformed faith rather from policy than from conviction. It was to the Protestants alone that she could look for support; her title to the crown was denied by every true Catholic in the realm, for she was the child of that marriage which the Pope had forbidden under pain of the penalties of the Church. But what doubtless contributed most to fix her in the determination to follow Henry's policy as regards the Papacy was her desire to possess supreme authority in ecclesiastical as well as in civil matters.

The religious houses which had been refounded by Mary were again dissolved, and Parliament by the two important Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity (1559) reëstablished the independence of the Church in England. The Act of Supremacy required all the clergy, and every person holding office under the crown, to take an oath declaring the queen to be the supreme governor of the realm in all spiritual as well as in all temporal things, and renouncing the authority or jurisdiction of any foreign prince or prelate. For refusing to deny the supremacy of the Pope many Catholics during Elizabeth's reign suffered death, and many more endured within the Tower the worse horrors of the rack.

The Act of Uniformity forbade any clergyman to use any but the Anglican liturgy, and required every person to attend the Established Church on Sunday and other holy days. The persecutions which arose under this law caused many Catholics to seek freedom of worship in other countries.

388. **The Protestant Nonconformists; Puritans and Separatists.** — The Catholics were not the only persons among Elizabeth's subjects who were opposed to the Anglican worship. There were Protestant nonconformists — the Puritans and Separatists — who troubled her almost as much as the Catholics.

The Puritans were so named because they desired a *purer* form of worship than the Anglican. The term was applied to them in derision; but the sterling character of those thus designated at length turned the epithet of reproach into a badge of honorable distinction. They did not withdraw from the Established Church, but remaining within its pale labored to reform it and to shape its discipline to their notions. These Puritans were destined to play a prominent part in the later affairs of England. Under the Stuarts, as we shall see, they became strong enough to overturn State and Church, and remold both to suit their own ideas.

The Separatists were still more zealous reformers than the Puritans. In their hatred of everything that bore any resemblance to the Catholic worship, they flung away the surplice and the prayer book, severed all connection with the Established Church, and refused to have anything to do with it. Under the Act of Uniformity they were persecuted with great severity, so that multitudes were led to seek an asylum upon the Continent. It was from among these exiles gathered in Holland that a little later came the passengers of the *Mayflower* and *Speedwell*, — the Pilgrim Fathers, who laid the foundations of civil liberty in the New World.

389. **Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots.** — A large part of the history of Elizabeth's reign is intertwined with the story of her cousin, Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, the "modern Helen," "the most beautiful, the weakest, the most attractive, and most attracted of women." She was the daughter of James V of Scotland, and to her *in right of birth* — according to all Catholics, who denied the validity of Henry's marriage with Anne Boleyn — belonged the English crown next after Mary Tudor.

Upon the death, in 1560, of her husband, Francis II of France, Mary gave up life at the French court and returned to her native land. She was now in her nineteenth year. The subtle charm of her beauty seems to have bewitched all who came into her presence, save the more zealous of the reformers, who could never forget that their young sovereign was a Catholic. The stern old John Knox made her life miserable. He called her a "Moabite," and other opprobrious names, till she wept from sheer vexation.

She dared not punish the impudent preacher, for she knew too well the strength of the Protestant feeling among her subjects.

Other things now conspired with Mary's hated religion to alienate entirely the love of her people. Her second husband, Lord Darnley, was murdered. The queen was suspected of having some guilty knowledge of the affair. She was imprisoned and forced to abdicate in favor of her infant son James.

Escaping from prison, Mary fled into England (1568). Here she threw herself upon the generosity of her cousin Elizabeth,

FIG. 65. — MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS. (After a modern popular painting. A comparison with the accompanying authentic portrait (Fig. 66) will show in what degree the subject has been idealized)

FIG. 66. — MARY STUART AS QUEEN OF FRANCE.[6] (After a contemporary and authentic portrait in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; from Cust's *Notes on the Authentic Portraits of Mary Queen of Scots*)

and entreated aid in recovering her throne. But the part which she was generally believed to have had in the murder of her husband, her disturbing claims to the English throne, and the fact that she was a Catholic all conspired to determine her fate. She was placed in confinement, and for nineteen years remained a prisoner. During all this time Mary was the center of

[6] The striking resemblance of this portrait of Mary to that of her cousin Elizabeth (Fig. 64) will be noticed.

innumerable plots on the part of the Catholics, which aimed at setting her upon the English throne. The Pope, Pius V, aided these conspirators by a bull excommunicating Elizabeth and releasing her subjects from their allegiance (1570). Finally, a carefully laid conspiracy to assassinate Elizabeth and place Mary on the throne was unearthed. The Spanish king, Philip II, was implicated. He wrote, "The affair is so much in God's service that it certainly deserves to be supported, and we must hope that our Lord will prosper it, unless our sins be an impediment thereto."

Mary was tried for complicity in the plot, was declared guilty, and, after some hesitation, feigned or otherwise, on the part of Elizabeth, was ordered to the block (1587). Even after Elizabeth had signed the warrant for her execution she attempted to evade responsibility in the matter by causing a suggestion to be made to Mary's jailers that they should kill her secretly.

390. The "Invincible Armada"; "Britain's Salamis" (1588).— The execution of Mary Stuart led immediately to the memorable attempt against England by the Spanish Armada. Before her death the Queen of Scots had by will disinherited her son and bequeathed to Philip II of Spain her claims to the English crown. To enforce these rights, to avenge the death of Mary, to punish Elizabeth for rendering aid to his rebellious subjects in the Netherlands, and to deal a fatal blow to the Reformation in Europe by crushing the Protestants of England, Philip resolved upon making a tremendous effort for the conquest of the heretical island. Vast preparations were made for carrying out this project, which Philip had long revolved in mind. Great fleets were gathered in the harbors of Spain, and a large army was assembled in the Netherlands to coöperate with the naval armament.

Pope Sixtus V encouraged Philip in the enterprise, which was thus rendered a sort of crusade. At last the fleet, consisting of about one hundred and thirty ships, the largest naval armament that had ever appeared upon the Atlantic, and boastfully called the "Invincible Armada," set sail from Lisbon for the Channel. The approaching danger produced a perfect fever of excitement in England. Never did Roman citizens rise more splendidly to

avert some terrible peril threatening the republic than the English people now arose as a single man to defend their island realm against the revengeful and ambitious project of Spain. The imminent danger served to unite all classes, the gentry and the yeomanry, Protestants and Catholics. The latter might intrigue to set a Mary Stuart on the English throne, but they were not ready to betray their land into the hands of the hated Spaniards. "In that memorable year," says Hallam, in a passage where his usually cold, judicial phrases flame into eloquence, "when the dark cloud gathered around our coasts, when Europe stood by in fearful suspense to behold what should be the result of that great cast in the game of human politics, what the craft of Rome, the power of Philip, the genius of Farnese, could achieve against the island queen with her Drakes and Cecils — in that agony of the Protestant faith and English name, they stood the trial of their spirit without swerving from their allegiance. It was then that the Catholics in every county repaired to the standard of the lord lieutenant, imploring that they might not be suspected of bartering the national independence for their religion itself."

On July 19, 1588, the Armada was first descried by the watchmen on the English cliffs. It swept up the Channel in the form of a great crescent, seven miles in width from tip to tip of horn. The English ships, about eighty in number, whose light structure and swift movements, together with the superior gunnery of their sailors, gave them a great advantage over the clumsy Spanish galleons, almost immediately began to impede their advance, and for seven days incessantly harassed the Armada.

One night, as the damaged fleet lay off the harbor of Calais, the English sent fire ships among the vessels, whereby a number were destroyed and a panic created among the others. A determined attack the next day by Howard, Drake, and Lord Henry Seymour inflicted a still severer loss upon the fleet.

The Spaniards, thinking now of nothing save escape, spread their sails in flight, proposing to get away by sailing northward around the British Isles. But the storms of the northern seas

dashed many of the remaining ships to pieces on the Scottish and the Irish shores. Barely one third of the ships of the Armada ever reëntered the harbors whence they sailed. When intelligence of the woeful disaster was carried to the imperturbable Philip, he simply said, "God's will be done; I sent my fleet to fight against the English, not against the elements."

Well may the great fight in the Channel which shattered the Armada be called "Britain's Salamis"; for like Athens' Salamis

FIG. 67.—SPANISH AND ENGLISH WAR VESSELS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. (From an engraving)

it revealed the weakness and proclaimed the downfall of a vast despotic empire, while at the same time it disclosed the strength and announced the rise of a new free state destined to a great future.

But the destruction of the Spanish Armada concerned other than purely English and Spanish interests. It marked the turning point in the great duel between Catholicism and Protestantism. It set definite limits to the Catholic reaction. It not only decided that England was to remain Protestant, but it foreshadowed the independence of the Protestant Netherlands, and

assured, or at least greatly helped to assure, the future of Protestantism in Scandinavia and in North Germany.

391. **Philip tampers with the Irish; the Tyrone Rebellion** (1594–1603). — Having failed in his direct attack upon England, Philip now sought to harass Elizabeth by giving aid to her Irish enemies.

Ireland had never been thoroughly subjugated by the English, and the native tribes were in a state of chronic revolt against the English intruders. In 1594 an insurrection, headed by the Earl of Tyrone (Hugh O'Neill), having broken out in Ulster, Philip promised to send the insurgents aid. To prevent his doing so, Elizabeth sent a fleet to harass him at home. The English sailed into the port of Cadiz, destroyed every vessel in the harbor, sacked the city, and left it a heap of ruins (1596). This destruction of her chief seaport was even more humiliating to Spain than the destruction of her "Invincible Armada."

The Irish rebels, because of their dallyings with Philip, were now proceeded against with vigor. The Celtic resistance was finally broken, mainly by the removal of the natives from some of the best regions of the island and the filling of the places thus made empty with Scottish and English settlers (sec. 461).

392. **Maritime and Colonial Enterprises.** — The crippling of the naval power of Spain left England mistress of the seas. The little island realm now entered upon the most splendid period of her history. These truly were "the spacious times of great Elizabeth." The English people, stirred by recent events, seemed to burn with a feverish impatience for maritime adventure and glory. Many a story of the daring exploits of English sea rovers during the reign of Elizabeth seems like a repetition of some tale of the old Vikings.

Among all these sea rovers, half explorer, half adventurer, Sir Francis Drake (about 1540–1596) was preëminent. Before the Armada days he had sailed round the globe (1577–1580), bringing home with him an immense booty which he had got as ransom from the cities of Peru and Chile, and for the achievement had been knighted by Queen Elizabeth.

Especially deserving of mention among the enterprises of these stirring and romantic times are the undertakings and adventures

of Sir Walter Raleigh (1552?–1618). Several expeditions were sent out by him for the purpose of making explorations and forming settlements in the New World. One of these, which explored the central coasts of North America, returned with such glowing accounts of the beauty and richness of the land visited, that, in honor of the virgin queen, it was named *Virginia*.

Raleigh attempted to establish colonies in the new land (1585–1590), but the settlements were unsuccessful. The settlers, however, when they returned home, carried back with them the tobacco plant, and introduced into England the habit of smoking it.[7] It was at this time also that the potato, a native product of the New World, was brought to Ireland. These together with maize, or Indian corn, were the chief return the New World made to the Old for the great number of domesticated plants and grains which it received from thence.

393. **The Queen's Death.** — The closing days of Elizabeth's reign were to her personally dark and gloomy. She seemed to be burdened with a secret grief[8] as well as by the growing infirmities of age. She died March 24, 1603, in the seventieth year of her age and the forty-fifth of her reign. With her ended the Tudor line of English sovereigns.

Literature of the Elizabethan Era

394. **Influences Favorable to Literature.** — The years covered by the reign of Elizabeth constitute one of the most momentous periods in history. It was the age when Europe was most deeply stirred by the Reformation. It was, too, a period of marvelous physical and intellectual expansion and growth. The discoveries of Columbus and others had created a New World. The Renaissance had re-created the Old World, — had revealed an unsuspected treasure in the civilizations of the past. Thus everything conspired to quicken men's intellect and stimulate their imagination.

[7] Some years before this the plant had been carried to Spain and to France, but seems to have been valued mainly for its medicinal qualities.

[8] In 1601 she sent to the block her chief favorite, the Earl of Essex, who had been found guilty of treason.

An age of such activity and achievement almost of necessity gives birth to a strong and vigorous literature. And thus is explained, in part at least, how during this period the English people — for no people of Europe felt more deeply the stir and movement of the times, nor helped more to create this same stir and movement, than the English nation — should have developed a literature of such originality and richness and strength as to make it the prized inheritance of all the world. "The great writers who shine in the literary splendor of the Elizabethan Age," says an eminent critic, "were the natural product of the newly awakened, thoughtful English nation of that day."

395. **The Writers.** — To make special mention of all the great writers who adorned the Elizabethan era would carry us quite beyond the limits of our book. Having said something of the influence under which they wrote, we will simply add that this age was the age of Shakespeare and Spenser and Bacon.[9]

Selections from the Sources. — MORE'S *Utopia* is the choicest literary product of the early revival of learning in England. The student should not fail to read it carefully. It lights up at once the social, the political, and the religious world of the time (cf. sec. 377). For a great variety of illustrative material, turn to ADAMS and STEPHENS, *Select Documents of English Constitutional History*, pp. 213–326; HENDERSON, *Side Lights on English History*, pp. 1–32; and KENDALL, *Source-Book*, chaps. viii, ix, and x. In PAYNE, *Voyages of the Elizabethan Seamen* (First Series, Oxford, 1893), read "The Famous Voyage of Sir Francis Drake into the South Sea," pp. 196–229.

Secondary Works. — *The Cambridge Modern History*, vol. i, chap. xiv. GREEN, *Short History of the English People*, chaps. vi and vii. FROUDE, *English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century* and *The Spanish Story of the Armada*. GASQUET, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* and *The Eve of the Reformation*. These are the works of an eminent Catholic scholar. POLLARD, *Henry VIII*. CREIGHTON, *Queen Elizabeth*. BOURNE, *Sir Philip Sidney*. In the Twelve English Statesmen series, CREIGHTON, *Cardinal Wolsey*, and BEESLY, *Queen Elizabeth*. For constitutional matters, turn to HALLAM'S, TASWELL-LANGMEAD'S, and MACY'S constitutional histories. For concise narrations of the events dealt with in this chapter, see GARDINER'S, MONTGOMERY'S, TERRY'S, COMAN and KENDALL'S, ANDREWS',

[9] William Shakespeare (1564–1616); Edmund Spenser (1552?–1599); Francis Bacon (1561–1626). Shakespeare and Bacon, it will be noticed, outlived Elizabeth.

and CHEYNEY's text-books on English history. And for biographical information, turn to the excellent articles in the English *Dictionary of National Biography*.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Voyages of John and Sebastian Cabot. 2. Sir Thomas More and his *Utopia*. 3. The story of Lady Jane Grey. 4. Sir Walter Raleigh's exploring and colonizing enterprises in the new lands. 5. The introduction from the New World into Europe of the potato, maize, and the tobacco plant. 6. The Earl of Essex and Queen Elizabeth.



FIG. 68. — MELROSE ABBEY. (From a photograph)

As the ruins of Fountains Abbey (see Plate VI) are a memorial of the iconoclasm of the Reformation movement in England, so are the remains of Melrose Abbey a like monument of the iconoclastic phase of the Reformation in Scotland. With the change in doctrines there, the monks of the historic abbey — it was founded in the thirteenth century — were driven out and the beautiful sculptures of the abbey church defaced

FIG. 69. — TYPICAL DUTCH SCENE: ZAANDAM. (From a photograph)

CHAPTER XXIII

THE REVOLT OF THE NETHERLANDS: RISE OF THE DUTCH REPUBLIC (1572–1609)

396. The Country. — The name Netherlands (lowlands) was formerly applied to all that district in the northwest of Europe, much of it sunk below the level of the sea, now occupied by the kingdoms of the Netherlands and Belgium. A large part of this region is simply the delta accumulations of the Rhine and other rivers emptying into the North Sea. Originally it was often overflowed by its streams and inundated by the ocean.

But this unpromising morass, protected at last by heavy dikes seaward against the invasions of the ocean, and by great embankments inland against the overflow of its streams, was destined to become the site of the most potent cities of Europe, and the seat of one of the foremost commonwealths of modern times.

397. The People: Celt and German. — Much light is thrown upon the history of the Netherlands by keeping in mind the difference in race between the original population of the northern and that of the southern provinces of the country.

When the Romans first came in contact with the inhabitants of this region, the southern portion of the land was held by Celtic tribes, known as the Belgæ, while the northern part was the home of German clans, chief among which were the Frisians and Batavians. These races, kept apart by differences in language

and temperament, unfortunately were never fused into a single people; and when finally, in the sixteenth century, there came a crisis in the life of the European nations, and they were each called upon to choose between the Old Church and the New, the northern and the southern Netherlanders made different choices, and went divergent ways. In the contrasted histories of the predominantly Gallic South and the predominantly German North, — the former represented to-day by the Catholic kingdom of Belgium, and the latter by the Protestant kingdom of the Netherlands, — some historians find support for the theory that race is a potent influence in shaping the destinies of a people.

398. State of the Country at the Opening of the Modern Age. — No country in Europe made greater progress in civilization during the mediæval era than the Netherlands. At the opening of the sixteenth century they contained a crowded and busy population of three million souls. The ancient marshes had been transformed into carefully kept gardens and orchards. The walled cities numbered between two and three hundred, while thriving villages and hamlets were counted by the thousand.

The great cities that dotted the country depended chiefly for their wealth and power upon their manufactures and commerce, the carrying trade of Northern Europe being largely in the hands of the bold and skillful Netherland sailors. These cities had usurped the place once held by the Hansa towns of Germany. Antwerp, situated on the Scheldt, rivaled even the greatest of the Italian cities. "I was sad when I saw Antwerp," writes a Venetian ambassador, "for I saw Venice surpassed."

399. The Low Countries under Charles V (1515–1555). — The Netherlands, it will be recalled, were part of those possessions over which the Emperor Charles V ruled by hereditary right. We have seen how towards the close of his reign he set up here the Inquisition with the object of suppressing the heresy of the reformers (sec. 348). Many persons perished at the stake and upon the scaffold, or were strangled, or buried alive.[1] But when Charles retired to the monastery at Yuste, the reformed doctrines

[1] Charles' persecutions covered the years from 1521 to 1555. The number of martyrs during these years has been greatly exaggerated; it was put as high as one

were, notwithstanding all his efforts, far more widely spread and deeply rooted in the Netherlands than when he entered upon their extirpation by fire and sword.

400. Accession of Philip II. — In 1555, in the presence of an august and princely assembly at Brussels, and amidst the most imposing and dramatic ceremonies, Charles V abdicated the crown whose weight he could no longer bear, and placed it upon the head of his son Philip. What sort of man this son was, we have already learned (sec. 350).

Philip remained in the Netherlands after his coronation four years, employing much of his time in devising means to root out the heresy of Protestantism. In 1559 he set sail for Spain, never to return. His arrival in the peninsula was celebrated by an *auto de fe* at Valladolid, festivities which ended in the burning of thirteen persons whom the Inquisition had condemned as heretics.

It was not delight at the sight of suffering that led Philip on his home-coming to be a spectator at these awful solemnities. He doubtless wished through his presence to give sanction to the work of the Holy Office, and to impress all with the fact that unity of religion in Spain, as the necessary basis of peace and unity in the state, was going to be maintained by him at any and every cost.

401. "Long live the Beggars!" — Upon his departure from the Netherlands, Philip intrusted the government to his half-sister Margaret, Duchess of Parma, as regent.

Under the administration of Margaret (1559–1567) the persecution of the Protestants went on with renewed bitterness. At last the nobles leagued together and resolved to petition the regent for a redress of grievances. When the duchess learned that the petitioners were about to wait upon her, she displayed great agitation. Thereupon one of her councilors exclaimed, "What, madam! afraid of these beggars?"

The expression was carried to the nobles, who were assembled at a banquet. Straightway one of their number suspended a beggar's

hundred thousand by the celebrated Dutch jurist, Grotius (d. 1645). Blok believes the number actually suffering the death penalty was less than one thousand. See his *History of the People of the Netherlands*, vol. ii, p. 317.

wallet from his neck and, filling a wooden bowl with wine, proposed the toast, "Long live the beggars!" The name was tumultuously adopted and became the party designation of the patriot Netherlanders during their long struggle with the Spanish power.

402. **The Iconoclasts** (1566). — The only reply of the government to the petition of the nobles for a mitigation of the severity of the edicts concerning heresy was a decree termed the Moderation, which substituted hanging for burning in the case of condemned heretics.

The pent-up indignation of the people at length burst forth in uncontrollable fury. They gathered in great mobs and proceeded to demolish every image they could find in the churches throughout the country. The monasteries, too, were sacked, their libraries burned, and the inmates driven from their cloisters. The tempest destroyed innumerable art treasures, which have been as sincerely mourned by the lovers of the beautiful as the burned rolls of the Alexandrian library have been lamented by the lovers of learning.

403. **The Duke of Alva and the "Council of Blood"** (1567). — The year following this outbreak Philip sent to the Netherlands a veteran Spanish army, "one of the most perfect engines of war ever seen in any age," headed by the Duke of Alva, a man after Philip's own heart, deceitful, fanatical, and merciless.

Alva was one of the ablest generals of the age, and the intelligence of his coming threw the provinces into a state of the greatest agitation and alarm. Those who could do so hastened to get out of the country. William the Silent, Prince of Orange,[2] one of the leading noblemen of the Lowlands, fled to Germany, where he began to gather an army of volunteers for the struggle which he now saw to be inevitable.

Egmont and Hoorn, Catholic noblemen[3] of high rank and great distinction, were treacherously seized, cast into prison, and soon

[2] He bore also the title of Count of Nassau. Nassau was a little German state, now included in Prussia. Orange was a petty principality on the Rhone, near Avignon. It came into the hands of the family of Nassau in 1530.

[3] Many Catholics sympathized at first with the Protestants and acted with them, because they felt that Philip's acts were in direct violation of the chartered rights and privileges of the cities and provinces of the Netherlands. But Egmont and Hoorn had been guilty of no overt acts, and their fate was undeserved.

afterwards beheaded. The duchess was relieved of the government, which was committed to the firmer hands of Alva, who, to aid him in the management of affairs, organized a most iniquitous tribunal, known in history as the "Council of Blood."

The Inquisition was now reëstablished, and a perfect reign of terror began. The number of Alva's victims during his short rule — he is said to have boasted that he had put to death over eighteen thousand — might almost persuade us that he had deliberately purposed the extermination of the people of the Netherlands.

Besides being subjected to this religious persecution, the Netherlanders were oppressed by iniquitous taxes, particularly by an imposition known as "the tenth penny," a tax of ten per cent on all sales of commodities. This was ruinous to business, and drove the thrifty burghers almost to desperation.

404. William of Orange. — The eyes of all patriot Netherlanders were now turned to the Prince of Orange as their only deliverer. The prince, though never a zealous Church partisan, was a deeply religious man, and believed himself called of Heaven to the work of rescuing his country from Spanish tyranny. Up to this time he had been a Catholic, having been brought up as a page in the household of the Emperor Charles V. He now embraced Protestantism; but both as a Catholic and as a Protestant he opposed persecution on account of religious belief. His attitude here is worthy of special notice, for it set him apart from the great majority of his contemporaries, and had a vast influence in shaping the policies and the destinies of the small yet great commonwealth of which he was to be the founder.

FIG. 70. — WILLIAM OF ORANGE (THE SILENT). (After a painting by *Mierevelt*, Amsterdam)

William of Orange, like our own Washington, was a statesman rather than a soldier; yet even as a leader in war he evinced talent of a high order. The Spanish armies were commanded successively by the most experienced and distinguished generals of Europe; but the prince coped ably with them all, and in the masterly service which he rendered his country earned the title of "The Founder of Dutch Liberties."

405. **The Isolation of the Provinces.** — Never did any people make a more heroic defense of their religious and civil liberties than did the Netherlanders. The struggle lasted for more than a generation, — for over forty years. The Netherlanders sustained the unequal contest almost single-handed; for, though they found sympathy among the Protestants of Germany, France, and England, they never received material assistance from any of these countries excepting England, and it was not until late in the struggle that aid came from this source.

As regards the German Protestants, they were too much divided among themselves to render efficient aid, and besides, being mostly Lutherans, they had little zeal for the cause of the Dutch Protestants, who were in the main Calvinists; and just at the moment when the growing Protestant sentiment in France encouraged the Netherlanders to look confidently for help from the Huguenot party there, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew extinguished forever all hope of succor from that quarter. So the little revolted provinces were left to carry on practically unaided, as best they might, a contest with the most powerful monarch of Christendom.

406. **The Capture of Briel (1572); the Beginning of the Sea Power of the Dutch.** — It was the nature of their country, half land, half water, which enabled the Dutch to make such a prolonged and finally successful resistance to the power of Spain. The Dutch triumphed because the sea helped them. The influence that this element was to exert upon the struggle was foreshadowed early in the conflict by a celebrated exploit of Dutch seamen.

The circumstances of this exploit were these. Almost at the outset of the war the Prince of Orange had commissioned some

sailors as privateers to prey upon Spanish ships and to harass the coast towns which favored the enemy. Soon the sea was swarming with these privateers, — Water Beggars, they were called, — who, out of reach of restraint, became veritable freebooters, and revived the days and emulated the deeds of the Saxon corsairs who a thousand years before had put out from these same or neighboring creeks and lagoons.

One day a squadron of twenty or more ships of these buccaneers, expelled from English harbors, made a descent upon the port of Briel (or Brill) in Holland, seized the place, and held it for the Prince of Orange. It was a small affair in itself, somewhat like the affair at Lexington in the American Revolution, but it stirred wonderfully the people of the Lowlands. Straightway other places opened their gates to the Water Beggars, and thus the rebellion speedily gained a secure basis for regular naval operations. It was the real beginning of the great sea power of the future Dutch Republic, which for two hundred years was to be a potent force in history.

Having now gained some idea of the causes of the revolt and the nature of the struggle, we must hurry on to the issue of the matter. In so doing we shall pass unnoticed many sieges and battles, negotiations and treaties.[4]

407. **"The Spanish Fury"; the Pacification of Ghent** (1576). — The year 1576 was marked by a revolt of the Spanish soldiers on account of their not receiving their pay, the costly war having drained Philip's treasury. The mutinous army marched through the land, pillaging city after city and paying themselves with the spoils. The beautiful city of Antwerp was ruined. The atrocities committed by the frenzied soldiers caused the outbreak to be called the "Spanish Fury."

The terrible state of affairs led to an alliance between Holland and Zealand and the other fifteen provinces of the Netherlands, known in history as the Pacification of Ghent (1576). The resistance to the Spanish crown had thus far been carried on without

[4] Read in Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic* the siege and sack of Haarlem and the relief of Leyden.

concerted action among the several states, the Prince of Orange having hitherto found it impossible to bring the different provinces to agree to any plan of general defense.

408. **The Union of Utrecht** (1579). — With the Spanish forces under the lead first of Don John of Austria, the hero victor of Lepanto (sec. 354), and afterwards of Prince Alexander of Parma, a commander of most distinguished ability, the war now went on with increased vigor, fortune, with many vacillations, inclining to the side of the Spaniards. Disaffection arose among the Netherlanders, the outcome of which was the separation of the northern and southern provinces. The seven Protestant states of the North, the chief of which were Holland and Zealand, by the Treaty of Utrecht (1579), drew together in a permanent confederation, known as the Seven United Provinces of the Netherlands, with the Prince of Orange as stadtholder. In this league was laid the foundation of the renowned Dutch Republic.

Fortunate would it have been for the Netherlands could all of the states at this time have been brought to act in concert. Under the leadership of the Prince of Orange the seventeen provinces might have been consolidated into a powerful nation that might now be reckoned among the great states of Europe. However, it was destined to be otherwise. The ten Catholic provinces of the South, although they continued their contest with Philip a little longer, ultimately submitted to Spanish tyranny. Portions of these provinces were eventually absorbed by France, while the remainder after varied fortunes finally became the present kingdom of Belgium. With their history we shall have no further concern at present, but turn now to follow the fortunes of the rising republic of the North.

409. **The "Ban" and the "Apology"** (1580–1581). — William of Orange was, of course, the animating spirit of the confederacy formed by the Treaty of Utrecht. In the eyes of Philip and his viceroys he appeared the sole obstacle in the way of the pacification of the provinces and their return to civil and ecclesiastical obedience. In vain had Philip sent against him the ablest and most distinguished commanders of the age; in vain had he

endeavored to detach him from the cause of his country by magnificent bribes of titles, offices, and fortune.

Philip now resolved to employ public assassination[5] for the removal of the invincible general and the incorruptible patriot. He published a ban against the prince, declaring him an outlaw and "the chief disturber of all Christendom and especially of these Netherlands," and offering any one who would deliver him into his hands "dead or alive" pardon for any crime he might have committed, a title of nobility, and twenty-five thousand crowns in gold or in lands.

The prince responded to the infamous edict by a remarkable paper entitled "The Apology of the Prince of Orange," the most terrible arraignment of tyranny that was ever penned. The "Apology" was scattered throughout Europe, and everywhere produced a profound impression.

410. The Declaration of Independence (July 26, 1581). — The United Provinces had not yet formally renounced their allegiance to the Spanish crown. They now deposed Philip as their sovereign, broke in pieces his seal, and put forth to the world their memorable Declaration of Independence, a document as sacred to the Dutch as the Declaration of 1776 is to Americans.

The preamble contains these words: "Whereas God did not create the people slaves to their prince, to obey his commands, whether right or wrong, but rather the prince for the sake of the subjects, to govern them according to equity, to love and support them as a father his children or a shepherd his flock, and even at the hazard of life to defend and preserve them; [therefore] when he does not behave thus, but, on the contrary, oppresses them,

[5] We use the expression "public assassination" in order to indicate a change in Philip's methods. He had all along tried to get rid of the prince by private or secret assassination. Now his edict of outlawry makes the proposed assassination avowedly a public or governmental affair. To comprehend this proceeding we must bear in mind that in the sixteenth century assassination was not looked upon with that utter abhorrence with which we rightly regard it; in the language of the historian Lingard, it was then "one of the recognized weapons of constitutional power." In the petty states of Italy it was a weapon resorted to almost universally, and seemingly without any compunctions of conscience, and even in the North many of the rulers at one time and another had recourse to it. Compare secs. 389, 420, and 431.

seeking opportunities to infringe their ancient customs and privileges, exacting from them slavish compliance, then he is no longer a prince, but a tyrant, and the subjects . . . may not only disallow his authority, but legally proceed to the choice of another prince for their defense."

This language was a wholly new dialect to the ears of Philip and of princes like him. They had never heard anything like it before uttered in such tones by a whole people. But it was a language destined to spread wonderfully and to become very common. We shall hear it often enough a little later in the era of the Revolution. It will become familiar speech in England, in America, in France, — almost everywhere.[6]

411. **Assassination of the Prince of Orange.** — "The ban soon bore fruit." Upon the 10th day of July, 1584, after five previous unsuccessful attempts had been made upon his life, the Prince of Orange was fatally shot by an assassin named Balthasar Gérard. Philip approved the murder as "an exploit of supreme value to Christendom." The murderer was put to death with hideous torture, but his heirs received the promised reward, being endowed with certain of the estates of the prince and honored by elevation to the rank of the Spanish nobility.

The character of William the Silent is one of the most admirable portrayed in all history. His steadfast and unselfish devotion to the cause of his country deservedly won for him the love of all classes. His people fondly called him "Father William." "As long as he lived," writes Motley, "he was the guiding star of a whole brave nation; and when he died the little children cried in the streets."

412. **Progress of the War; the Truce of 1609.** — Severe as was the blow sustained by the Dutch patriots in the death of the Prince of Orange, they did not lose heart, but continued the struggle with the most admirable courage and steadfastness.

[6] It has been asserted that the Declaration had an influence in shaping the English Declaration of Rights in 1689 and the American Declaration of Independence in 1776; but there is no evidence that in either of these cases the Dutch Declaration was either known or consulted, or that it had the slightest influence.

Prince Maurice, a mere youth of seventeen years, the second son of William, was chosen stadtholder in his place, and he proved himself a worthy son of the great chief and patriot.

The war now went on with unabated fury. France as well as England became involved, both fighting against Philip, who was now laying claims to the crowns of both countries. To tell of the

battles on land lost and won, of the naval combats on almost every sea beneath the skies, would be a story without end. The destruction of the Spanish Armada in 1588 marked the turning point of the struggle, yet not the end of it. Philip II died in 1598, but the losing fight was carried on by his successor, Philip III.

Europe finally grew weary of the seemingly interminable struggle, and the Spanish commanders becoming convinced that it was impossible to reduce the Dutch rebels to obedience by force

of arms, negotiations were entered into which issued in the celebrated Truce of 1609.[7] This truce was in reality an acknowledgment by Spain of the independence of the United Provinces of the Netherlands, although the Spanish king was so unwilling to admit the fact of his inability to reduce the rebel states to submission that the treaty was termed simply "a truce for twelve years." [8] Spain did not formally acknowledge their independence until forty years afterwards, in the Peace of Westphalia, at the end of the Thirty Years' War (1648).

Thus ended, after a continuance of over forty years, one of the most memorable contests of which history tells. The memories of these great days, handed down to later generations of Netherlanders, formed a rich and ennobling heritage which, we may believe, entered as an element of strength into the Dutch character; for "such traditions," as the historian Häusser truly says, "keep a nation upright for centuries."

413. Influence of the Establishment of the Dutch Republic upon both the Religious and the Political Revolution. — The successful issue of the revolt in the Netherlands meant much for the cause of the reformers. The Protestant Lowlands formed a sort of strategic point in the great fight between Catholicism and Protestantism. The loss of this ground might have proved fatal to the Protestant cause. Its maintenance by the forces of the reformers set limits to the Catholic reaction.

The establishment of the Dutch Republic had also great significance for the Political Revolution. In the seventeenth century it was Holland that was the foremost champion of the cause of political freedom against Bourbon despotism. It was a worthy descendant of the first Prince William of Orange who, at one of

[7] In 1598 peace had been made between Spain and France (sec. 423, n. 5), and then in 1604 between Spain and England. One of the most noteworthy events of the later period of the war was the long and finally successful siege by the Spaniards of Ostend, "The Troy of modern history."

[8] During this truce period (1609–1621) the Dutch Republic was filled with discord through the bitter quarrels of religious and political parties within the little state. The most eminent of the Dutch statesmen of the period was John of Barneveld (1549?–1619). See his *Life* by Motley.

the most critical moments of English history, when Englishmen were struggling doubtfully against Stuart tyranny, came to their help and rescued English liberties from the peril in which they lay (sec. 497).

Selections from the Sources. — *Old South Leaflets*, No. 72, "The Dutch Declaration of Independence"; No. 69, "The Description of the New Netherlands."

Secondary Works. — MOTLEY, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic* and *History of the United Netherlands*. These histories by Motley are classical, but they lack in judicial spirit. They should be read in connection with BLOK, *History of the People of the Netherlands*. YOUNG, *History of the Netherlands*. HARRISON, *William the Silent*. PUTNAM, *William the Silent*. For New Netherlands, consult FISKE, *The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America*. See also bibliography for Chapter XXI.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The protective waterworks of the Low Countries. 2. The Netherlands under the dukes of Burgundy. 3. The Iconoclasts. 4. How William of Orange acquired his title of "The Silent." 5. The siege and relief of Leyden. 6. The New Netherlands.

FIG. 71. — COAT OF ARMS OF WILLIAM, PRINCE OF ORANGE.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE HUGUENOT WARS IN FRANCE (1562–1629)

414. The Reformation in France. — Before Luther posted his ninety-five theses at Wittenberg there had appeared in the University of Paris and elsewhere in France men who from the study of the Scriptures had come to entertain opinions very like those of the German reformer. The movement thus begun received a fresh impulse from the uprising in Germany under Luther.

The Reformation in France, as elsewhere, brought dissension, persecution, and war. We have already seen how the Valois[1] king Francis I waged an exterminating crusade against his heretical Waldensian subjects (sec. 345). His son and successor, Henry II, also conceived it to be his duty to uproot heresy; and it was his persecution of his Protestant subjects — a persecution largely instigated by his infamous mistress, Diane de Poitiers — that sowed the seed of those long and woeful religious wars which he left as a terrible legacy to his three feeble sons, Francis, Charles, and Henry, who followed him in succession upon the throne.

Notwithstanding the persecutions of Francis I and Henry II, the reformed faith gained ground rapidly in France during their reigns, so that by the time of Henry's death the followers of the reformed creed numbered probably between one and two millions. The new doctrines had found adherents especially among the lesser nobility and the burgher class, and had struck deep root in the south, — the region of the old Albigensian heresy.

415. King Francis II, Catherine de' Medici, and the Guises. — Francis II began his reign in 1559. His wife was the young and

[1] The Valois kings (compare sec. 238, n. 13) of the sixteenth century were Louis XII (1498–1515), Francis I (1515–1547), Henry II (1547–1559), Francis II (1559–1560), Charles IX (1560–1574), Henry III (1574–1589). Henry IV, the successor of Henry III, was the first of the Bourbons.

fascinating Mary Stuart of Scotland. Francis was a weak-minded boy of sixteen years. The power behind the throne was his mother, Catherine de' Medici, and the chiefs of the family of the Guises.

Catherine was an Italian. She seems to have been almost or quite destitute of religious convictions of any kind. She was determined to rule, and this she did by holding the balance of power between the two religious parties. When it suited her purpose, she favored the Protestants; and when it suited her purpose better, she favored the Catholics. Through her counsels and policies she contributed largely to make France wretched through the reigns of her three sons, and to bring her house to a miserable end.

At the head of the family of the Guises stood Francis, Duke of Guise, and his brother Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine. Both of these men were zealous Catholics. Mary Stuart, the young queen, was their niece, and through her they ruled the boy king.

416. The Huguenot[2] Leaders: the Bourbon Princes and Admiral Coligny. — Opposed to the Guises were the Bourbon princes, Antony, king of Navarre, and Louis, Prince of Condé. Next after the brothers of Francis II, they were heirs to the French throne.

Gaspard de Coligny, Admiral of France, was "the military hero of the French Reformation." Early in life he had embraced the doctrines of the reformers, and remained to the last the trusted and consistent, though ill-starred, champion of the Protestants. His is the most heroic figure that emerges from the unutterable confusion of the times.

The foregoing notice of parties and their chiefs will suffice to render intelligible the events which we now have to narrate.

417. The Massacre of Vassy (1562). — After the short reign of Francis II (1559–1560) his brother Charles came to the throne as Charles IX. He was only ten years of age, so the queen mother assumed the government in his name. Pursuing her favorite maxim to rule by setting one party as a counterpoise to the other, she gave the Bourbon princes a place in the government, and also by a royal edict gave the Huguenots a limited toleration and forbade their further persecution.

[2] This word is probably from the German *Eidgenossen*, meaning "oath comrades."

These concessions in favor of the Huguenots angered the Catholic chiefs, particularly the Guises; and it was the violation by the adherents of the Duke of Guise of the edict of toleration that finally caused the growing animosities of the two parties to break out in civil war. While passing through the country with a body of armed attendants, at a small place called Vassy the duke came upon a company of Huguenots assembled in a barn for worship. His retainers first insulted and then attacked them, killing about forty of the company and wounding many more.

Under the lead of Admiral Coligny and the Prince of Condé, the Huguenots now rose throughout France. Philip II of Spain sent an army to aid the Catholics, while Elizabeth of England extended help to the Huguenots.

418. The Treaty of St. Germain (1570). — For the lifetime of a generation France was distressed, almost without respite, by bitter internecine strife.[3] The rival princely houses of which we have spoken and their respective adherents exploited the situation, — that is to say, they took advantage of the religious situation to further their own ends. If one could imagine the Wars of the Roses in England carried on in the midst of the ferment of the Reformation, imagine the houses of York and Lancaster availing themselves of Protestant and Catholic prejudice and fanaticism, one

[3] The table below exhibits the wars of the entire period of which we are treating. Some make the religious wars proper end with the Edict of Nantes (1598); others with the fall of La Rochelle (1628).

First War (ended by Peace of Amboise)	1562–1563
Second War (ended by Peace of Longjumeau)	1567–1568
Third War (ended by Peace of St. Germain)	1568–1570
Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24	1572
Fourth War (ended by Edict of Boulogne)	1572–1573
Fifth War (ended by Peace of Monsieur)	1574–1576
Sixth War (ended by Peace of Bergerac)	1577
Seventh War (ended by Treaty of Fleix)	1580
Eighth War (War of the Three Henrys)	1585–1589
Henry of Bourbon, king of Navarre, secures the throne	1589
Ninth War	1589–1598
Edict of Nantes	1598
Siege and fall of La Rochelle	1627–1628

By the fall of La Rochelle the political power of the Huguenots was completely prostrated.

might thereby get some faint idea of what was going on in France during the so-called "Religious Wars."

The Treaty of St. Germain brought a short and, as it proved, delusive peace. The terms of the treaty were very favorable to the Huguenots. They received four towns, among which was La Rochelle, the stronghold of the Huguenot faith, which they might garrison and hold as places of safety and pledges of good faith.

To cement the treaty, Catherine de' Medici now proposed that the Princess Margaret, the sister of Charles IX, should be given in marriage to Henry of Bourbon, the new young king of Navarre. The announcement of the proposed alliance caused great rejoicing among Catholics and Protestants alike, and the chiefs of both parties crowded to Paris to attend the wedding, which took place on the 18th of August, 1572.

419. **The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day** (August 24, 1572). — Before the festivities which followed the nuptial ceremonies were over, the world was shocked by one of the most awful crimes recorded by history, — the massacre of the Huguenots in Paris on St. Bartholomew's Day.

The circumstances which led to this fearful tragedy were as follows. Among the Protestant nobles who came up to Paris to attend the wedding was Admiral Coligny. The admiral had great influence over the young king, and this influence he used to draw him away from the queen mother and the Guises. Fearing the loss of her influence over her son, Catherine resolved upon the death of the admiral. The attempt miscarried, Coligny receiving only a slight wound from the assassin's ball.

The Huguenots rallied about their wounded chief with loud threats of revenge. Catherine, driven on by insane fear, now determined upon the death of all the Huguenots in Paris as the only measure of safety.[4] By the 23d of August, the plans for the massacre were all arranged. On the evening of that day Catherine went to her son and represented to him that the Huguenots had

[4] In the midst of the horror and panic of the tragedy the Protestants were led to believe that the massacre was the issue of a plot dating from the Treaty of St. Germain. The view is now known to be wholly unsupported by the facts.

formed a plot for the assassination of the royal family and the leaders of the Catholic party, and that the utter ruin of their house and cause could be averted only by the immediate destruction of the Protestants within the city walls. The order for the massacre was then laid before him for his signature. The weak-minded king shrank in terror from the deed, and at first refused to sign the decree; but overcome at last by the representations of his mother, he exclaimed, "I consent, provided not one Huguenot be left alive in France to reproach me with the deed."

A little past the hour of midnight on St. Bartholomew's Day (August 24, 1572), at a preconcerted signal, — the tolling of a bell, — the massacre began. Coligny was one of the first victims. For three days and nights the massacre went on within the city. The number of victims in Paris is variously estimated at from one thousand to ten thousand.

With the capital cleared of Huguenots, orders were issued to the principal cities of France to purge themselves in like manner of heretics. In many places the decree was disobeyed; but in others the orders were carried out, and frightful massacres took place. The number of victims throughout the country is unknown; estimates differ widely, running from two thousand to a hundred thousand.

The massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day raised a cry of execration in almost every part of the civilized world, among Catholics and Protestants alike. Philip II, however, is said to have received the news with unfeigned joy; while Pope Gregory XIII caused a *Te Deum*, in commemoration of the event, to be sung in the church of St. Mark in Rome. Respecting this it should in justice be said that Catholic writers maintain that the Pope acted under a misconception of the facts, it having been represented to him that the massacre resulted from a thwarted plot of the Huguenots against the royal family of France and the Catholic Church.

420. Reign of Henry III (1574–1589). — The massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, instead of exterminating heresy in France, only served to rouse the Huguenots to a more determined defense of their faith. Throughout the last two years of the reign of

Charles IX and the fifteen succeeding years of the reign of his brother Henry III the country was in a state of turmoil and war. By granting privileges to the Huguenots, Henry angered the Catholics, who, for the maintenance of the ancient Church, formed what was known as the Holy League, the head of which was the third Duke of Guise. Finally, in 1589, the king, who jealous of the growing power and popularity of the duke had caused him to be assassinated, was himself struck down by the avenging dagger of a Dominican monk. With him ended the House of Valois.

421. **Accession of Henry IV** (1589). — Henry of Bourbon, king of Navarre, who for many years had been the most prominent leader of the Huguenots, now came to the throne as the first of the Bourbon kings. His accession lifted into prominence one of the most celebrated royal houses in European history. The political story of France, and indeed of Europe, from this time on to the French Revolution, and for some time after that, is in great part the story of the House of Bourbon.

FIG. 72. — HENRY IV, KING OF FRANCE. (From a painting by *F. Goltzius*)

Although the doctrines of the reformers had made rapid progress in France under the sons of Henry II, still the great majority of the nation at the time of the death of Henry III were Catholics in faith and worship. Under these circumstances we shall hardly expect to find the entire nation quietly acquiescing in the accession to the French throne of a Protestant prince, and he the leader and champion of the hated Huguenots. Nor did Henry secure without a struggle the crown that was his by right. The Catholic League had declared for Cardinal Bourbon, Henry's uncle, and France was thus kept in the whirl of civil war.

422. **Henry turns Catholic** (1593). — After the war had gone on for about four years the quarrel was closed, for the time being, by Henry's turning Catholic. Mingled motives led Henry to do this. He was personally liked, even by the Catholic chiefs, and he was well aware that it was only his Huguenot faith that prevented their being his hearty supporters. Hence duty and policy seemed to concur in urging him to remove the sole obstacle in the way of their ready loyalty, and thus to bring peace and quiet to distracted France.

The Catholic League now soon fell to pieces. Henry was crowned at Chartres; and shortly afterwards Paris, which had been in the hands of his enemies, opened its gates to him.

423. **The Edict of Nantes** (1598). — As soon as Henry had become the crowned and acknowledged king of France, he gave himself to the work of composing the affairs of his kingdom. The most noteworthy of the measures he adopted to this end was the publication of the celebrated Edict of Nantes (April 13, 1598).[5] By this decree the Huguenots were secured perfect freedom of conscience and practical freedom of worship.[6] Schools, hospitals, and all public offices and employments were opened to them the same as to Catholics. Moreover, they were allowed to retain possession of a number of fortified towns as pledges of good faith and as places of refuge and defense. Among these places was the important city of La Rochelle.

The granting of this edict is memorable for the reason that it was the first formal, though qualified, recognition by a great European state of the principle of religious toleration and equality.[7] Here, for the first time since the triumph of Christianity over paganism in the Roman Empire, a great nation makes a serious

[5] A few weeks after signing the Edict of Nantes, Henry concluded with Philip II the Treaty of Vervins (May 2, 1598), which closed the war with Spain.

[6] The greater nobles were licensed to hold general religious services in their castles; the lesser nobles to hold services for the members of their own families. Altogether about 3500 castles were thus made licensed places of Protestant worship.

[7] The provisions of the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 (sec. 347) fell far short, in religious liberalism, of the clauses of the edict. Even in the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 (sec. 433) Germany did not go as far in the direction of religious toleration as France had gone in 1598.

effort to try to get along with two creeds in the state. It was almost a century before even England went as far in the way of granting freedom of conscience and of worship.

424. **Character of Henry IV's Reign; his Plans and Death.** — The temporary hushing of the long-continued quarrels of the Catholics and Protestants by the adoption of the principle of religious toleration paved the way for a revival of the trade and industries of the country, which had been almost destroyed by the anarchy and waste of the religious wars. France now entered upon such a period of prosperity as she had not known for many years. The material and social welfare of all his subjects, particularly of the lower classes, was Henry's special care. His paternal solicitude for his humblest subjects secured for him the title of "Father of his People."

In devising and carrying out his measures of reform, Henry was aided by one of the most prudent and sagacious advisers that ever strengthened the hands of a prince, — the illustrious Duke of Sully (1560–1641). The duke was an author as well as a statesman, and in his *Memoirs* left one of the most valuable records we possess of the transactions in which he took so prominent a part.

Remote America was not lost sight of by Henry. In 1608 Champlain, a Frenchman in the service of a company patronized by the king, upon a picturesque cliff four hundred miles up the St. Lawrence, founded Quebec, the future political and social center of New France.

Towards the close of his reign Henry, feeling strong in his resources and secure in his power, began to revolve in mind vast projects for the aggrandizement of France and the weakening of her old enemy, the House of Hapsburg, in both its branches.[8] He was making great preparations for war, when the dagger of

[8] In connection with his designs against the House of Hapsburg, Henry is represented in Sully's *Memoirs* as having had in mind a most magnificent scheme, which was nothing less than the organization of all the Christian states of Europe into a great confederation or commonwealth, and the abolition of war by the creation of an international peace tribunal. This scheme is known as the "Grand Design." It is not probable, however, that Henry was the author of it, as represented by Sully.

a fanatic by the name of Ravaillac, who regarded Henry as an enemy of the Catholic Church, cut short his life and plans (1610).

425. **Louis XIII (1610–1643); Cardinal Richelieu and his Policy.** — As Henry's son Louis, who succeeded him, was a mere child of nine years, during his minority the government was administered by his mother, Mary de' Medici. Upon attaining his majority, in 1617, Louis took the government into his own hands. He chose as his chief minister Cardinal Richelieu (1585–1642), the Wolsey of France, one of the most remarkable characters of the seventeenth century. From the time that Louis made the prelate his chief minister in 1624, the ecclesiastic became the actual sovereign of France, and for the space of eighteen years swayed the destinies not only of that country, but, it might almost be said, those of Europe as well.

FIG. 73.—CARDINAL RICHELIEU. (After the painting by *Philippe de Champagne*)

His policy was twofold: first, to render the authority of the French king absolute in France; second, to make the power of France supreme in Europe.

To attain the first end Richelieu sought (1) to crush the political power of the Huguenots; (2) to trample out the last vestige of independence among the old feudal aristocracy; (3) to suppress or to deprive of all real power the local assemblies and the parliaments, or courts of justice. To secure the second end, he labored to break down the power of both branches of the House of Hapsburg, that is, of Austria and Spain.

For nearly the lifetime of a generation Richelieu, by intrigue, diplomacy, and war, pursued with unrelenting purpose these objects of his ambition. In the following paragraph we shall speak very briefly of the cardinal's dealings with the Huguenots, which feature alone of his policy especially concerns us at present.

426. Siege and Capture of La Rochelle (1627–1628); Political Power of the Huguenots broken. — In the prosecution of his plans, one of Cardinal Richelieu's first steps was to break down the political power of the Huguenot chiefs, who, dissatisfied with their position in the government and irritated by religious grievances, were revolving in mind the founding in France of a Protestant commonwealth like that which the Prince of Orange and his adherents had set up in the Netherlands. The capital of this new republic was to be La Rochelle, on the western coast of France. In 1627, an alliance having been formed between England and the French Protestants, an English fleet and army were sent across the Channel to aid the Huguenot enterprise.

Richelieu now resolved to ruin forever the power of these Protestants who, "Protestants first and Frenchmen afterwards," were constantly challenging the royal authority and threatening the dismemberment of France. Accordingly, he led in person an army to the siege of La Rochelle, which, after a gallant resistance of more than a year, was compelled to open its gates (1628). That the place might never again be made the center of resistance to the royal power, Louis ordered that "the fortifications be razed to the ground in such wise that the plow may plow through the soil as through tilled land."

The Huguenots maintained the struggle a few months longer in the south of France, but were finally everywhere reduced to submission. The result of the war was the complete destruction of the political power of the French Protestants. A treaty of peace called the Edict of Grace, negotiated the year after the fall of La Rochelle, left them, however, freedom of worship, according to the provisions of the Edict of Nantes.

The Edict of Grace properly marks the close of the religious wars which had now distressed France for two generations. It is estimated that this series of wars cost the country a million lives, and that between three and four hundred hamlets and towns were destroyed by the contending parties.

427. Richelieu and the Thirty Years' War. — When Cardinal Richelieu came to the head of affairs in France, there was going

on in Germany the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648), of which we shall tell in the following chapter. This was very much such a struggle between the Catholic and Protestant German princes and cities as we have seen waged between the two religious parties in France.

Although Richelieu had just crushed French Protestantism, he now gave assistance to the Protestant German princes because their success meant the division of Germany and the humiliation of Austria. Richelieu did not live to see the end either of the Thirty Years' War or of that which he had begun with Spain; but this foreign policy of the great minister, carried out by others, finally resulted, as we shall learn hereafter, in the humiliation of both branches of the House of Hapsburg and the lifting of France to the first place among the powers of Europe.

Selections from the Sources. — DUKE OF SULLY, *Memoirs* (Bohn). For a short account of the contents of this work consult *Historical Sources in Schools* (Report to the New England History Teachers' Association, pp. 99–102). *Translations and Reprints*, vol. iii, No. 3, extracts under "The Reformation in France" (trans. by Merrick Whitcomb). *Old South Leaflets*, No. 91, "The Founding of Quebec (1608)."

Secondary Works. — BAIRD, *The Rise of the Huguenots*, *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, and *Theodore Beza*. BESANT, *Gaspard de Coligny*. ROBINSON, *Margaret of Angoulême*. WILLERT, *Henry of Navarre*. ADAMS, *The Growth of the French Nation*, chaps. xi and xii. HASSALL, *The French People*, chaps. x and xi. LODGE, *Richelieu*. PARKMAN, *Pioneers of France in the New World;* for the Huguenots in Florida and Brazil, and Champlain and his associates. See also FISKE, *New England and New France*, chaps. i–iii.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Catherine de' Medici. 2. Admiral Coligny and his project of French settlements in Brazil and Florida. 3. The Duke of Sully. 4. The founding of Quebec. 5. The "Grand Design."

CHAPTER XXV

THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR (1618–1648)

428. **Nature and Causes of the War.** — The long and calamitous Thirty Years' War was the last great combat between Protestantism and Catholicism in Europe. It started as a struggle between the Protestant and Catholic princes of Germany, but gradually involved almost all the states of the continent, degenerating at last into a shameful and heartless struggle for power and territory.

The real cause of the war was the enmity existing between the German Protestants and Catholics. But if a more specific cause be sought, it will be found in the character of the articles of the celebrated Religious Peace of Augsburg (sec. 347). The Catholics and Protestants did not interpret alike the provisions of that compromise treaty. Each party by its encroachments gave the other occasion for complaint. The Protestants at length formed for their mutual protection a league called the Evangelical Union (1608). In opposition to the Union, the Catholics formed a confederation known as the Holy League (1609). All Germany was thus prepared to burst into the flames of a religious war.

429. **The Bohemian Period of the War** (1618–1623). — The flames that were to desolate Germany for a generation were first kindled in Bohemia, where were still smoldering embers of the Hussite wars, which two centuries before had desolated that land. A church which the Protestants, relying on the provisions of a certain royal charter, maintained they had a right to build was torn down by the Catholics, and another was closed. Expostulations addressed by the reformers to the Emperor Matthias, as king of Bohemia, receiving an unsatisfactory reply, a body of Bohemian grandees entered the royal castle at Prague and threw two of the imperial regents out of the window (May 23, 1618). This hasty proceeding was the beginning of the Thirty Years'

War, — "the source and cause of all our woes," as wrote one who lived in the sad times that followed.

The Bohemian Protestants now rose in organized revolt against their Catholic king, Ferdinand,[1] elected a new Protestant king,[2] and drove out the Jesuits. The war had scarcely opened when, the imperial office falling vacant, Ferdinand was elected Emperor. With the power he now wielded, together with the help he received from the Catholic League, it was not a difficult matter for him to quell the Protestant insurrection in his royal dominions. The leaders of the revolt were executed, and the reformed faith in Bohemia was almost uprooted.

430. **The Danish Period** (1625–1629). — The situation of affairs at this moment in Germany, with a zealous and powerful Catholic, inclined and prepared to follow in the footsteps of Charles V, at the head of the Germanic body, filled not only the Protestant princes of Germany, but all the Protestant powers of the North, with the greatest alarm. Christian IV, king of Denmark, supported by England and the Dutch Netherlands, now again involved in war with Spain, threw himself into the struggle — which was still being carried on in a desultory manner — as the champion of German Protestantism. On the side of the Catholics were two noted commanders, — Tilly, the leader of the forces of the Holy League, and Wallenstein, a wealthy Bohemian nobleman, who was the commander of the imperial army. What is known as the Danish period of the war now begins (1625).

The war, in the main, proved disastrous to the Protestant allies,[3] and Christian IV was finally constrained to conclude a treaty of peace with the Emperor (Peace of Lübeck, 1629) and retire from the struggle.

By what is known as the Edict of Restitution (1629), the Emperor Ferdinand now restored to the Catholics all the ecclesiastical

[1] Ferdinand was the head of the House of Hapsburg, which family had long held the throne of Bohemia. After his election to the imperial office, mentioned a little farther on in the text, his title became Emperor Ferdinand II (1619–1637).

[2] Frederick V, Elector Palatine, son-in-law of James I of England.

[3] Among the important episodes of the war were the defeat of the king of Denmark by Tilly at Lutter (1626), and the unsuccessful siege of Stralsund by Wallenstein (1628).

lands and offices in North Germany of which possession had been taken by the Protestants in violation of the terms of the Peace of Augsburg.

431. The Swedish Period (1630–1635): Wallenstein, Gustavus Adolphus, Tilly — and Wallenstein again. — At this moment of seeming triumph, Ferdinand was constrained by rising discontent and jealousies to dismiss from his service his most efficient general, Wallenstein. Only a few months before this, Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden, with a veteran and enthusiastic army of sixteen thousand Swedes, had appeared in North Germany as the champion of the dispirited and leaderless Protestants. Various motives had concurred in leading him thus to intervene in the struggle. He was urged to this course by his strong Protestant convictions and sympathies. Furthermore, the progress of the imperial arms in North Germany was imperiling Swedish interests in the Baltic, and threatening to establish the supremacy of the Austrian Hapsburgs over what was regarded by the sovereigns of Sweden as a Swedish lake.



FIG. 74. — GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS. (From a painting by *Vandyke*)

The Protestant princes' jealousy and distrust of the Swede Gustavus now contributed to a most terrible disaster. At this moment Tilly was besieging the city of Magdeburg, which had dared to resist the Edict of Restitution (sec. 430). But the Electors of Brandenburg and Saxony, from whom the city should have received help, would not, or at least did not, coöperate with Gustavus in raising the siege. In a short time the fated city was taken by storm and was given up to sack and pillage.

Thousands of the inhabitants perished miserably. Tilly wrote to Ferdinand that since the fall of Troy and Jerusalem such a victory had never been seen. "I am sincerely sorry," he adds, "that the ladies of your imperial family could not have been present as spectators."

The cruel fate of Magdeburg excited the alarm of the Protestant princes. The Electors of Brandenburg and Saxony now united their forces with those of the Swedish king. Tilly was defeated with great loss in the celebrated battle of Leipzig, or Breitenfeld (1631), and Gustavus, emboldened by his success, pushed southward into the very heart of Germany. Attempting to dispute his march, Tilly's army was again defeated, and he himself received a fatal wound (1632). In the death of Tilly, Ferdinand lost his most trustworthy general.

The imperial cause appeared desperate. There was but one man in Germany who could turn the tide of victory that was running so strongly in favor of the Swedish monarch. That man was Wallenstein; and to him the Emperor now turned. Wallenstein agreed to raise an army, provided his control of it should be absolute. Ferdinand was constrained to grant all that his old general demanded. Wallenstein now raised his standard, to which rallied the adventurers not only of Germany but of all Europe as well. The array was a vast and heterogeneous host, bound together by no bonds of patriotism, loyalty, or convictions, but only by the spell and prestige of the name of Wallenstein.

With an army of forty thousand men obedient to his commands, Wallenstein, after numerous marches and countermarches, finally risked a battle with Gustavus on the memorable field of Lützen, in Saxony. The Swedes won the day, but lost their leader and sovereign (1632).

We may sum up the results of Gustavus Adolphus' intervention in the Thirty Years' War in these words of the historian Gindely: "He averted the overthrow with which Protestantism was threatened in Germany."

Notwithstanding the death of their great king and commander, the Swedes did not withdraw from the war. Hence the struggle

went on, the advantage being for the most part with the Protestant allies. Ferdinand, at just this time, was embarrassed by the suspicious movements of his general Wallenstein. Becoming convinced that he was meditating the betrayal of the imperial cause, the Emperor caused him to be assassinated (1634). This event marks very nearly the end of the Swedish period of the war.

432. **The Swedish-French Period** (1635–1648). — Had it not been for the selfish and ambitious interference of France, the woeful war which had now desolated Germany for half a generation might here have come to an end, for both sides were weary of it and ready for negotiations of peace. But Richelieu was not willing that the war should end until the House of Austria was completely humbled. Accordingly, he encouraged the Swedish chancellor Oxenstiern, as he had Gustavus, to carry on the war, promising him the aid of the French armies.

The war thus lost in large part its original character of a contention between the Catholic and Protestant princes of Germany, and became a political struggle between the House of Austria and the House of Bourbon, in which the former was fighting for existence, the latter for national aggrandizement.

And so the miserable war went on year after year. It had become a heartless and conscienceless struggle for spoils. The Swedes fought to fasten their hold upon the mouths of the German rivers, the French to secure a grasp upon the Rhine lands. The earlier actors in the drama at length passed from the scene, but their parts were carried on by others.

433. **The Peace of Westphalia** (1648). — It was just before the death of Richelieu, which occurred in 1642, that the first whisperings of peace were heard. Everybody was inexpressibly weary of the war and longed for the cessation of its horrors, yet each ruler and statesman wanted peace on terms advantageous to himself. The arrangement of the articles of peace was a matter of infinite difficulty, for the affairs and boundaries of the states of Central Europe were in almost hopeless confusion. To facilitate matters the commissioners were divided into two bodies, one holding its sessions at Osnabrück, and the other at Münster, both Westphalian

cities. After four years of discussion and negotiation, the articles of the celebrated Peace of Westphalia, as it is called, were signed by different European powers. The chief articles of this important peace may be made to fall under two heads, — those relating to territorial boundaries, and those respecting religion.

As to the first, these cut short in three directions the actual or nominal limits of the Holy Roman Empire. Switzerland and the United Netherlands were severed from it; for though both of these countries had been for a long time practically independent of the Empire, this independence had never been acknowledged in any formal way. The claim of France to the three bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun in Lorraine, which places she had held for about a century, was confirmed, and all Alsace, save the free city of Strasburg, was given to her. These Alsatian lands gave France a foothold on the Rhine and an open door into Germany, — a door which remained open until 1871, when Germany, determined to possess these valuable lands across her border, went to war against France, pushed her back from the river, and seized the coveted territory (sec. 714).

Sweden, already a great maritime power, was given territories in North Germany — Western Pomerania and other lands — which greatly enhanced her influence by giving her command of the mouths of three important German rivers, — the Oder, the Elbe, and the Weser. But these lands were not given to the Swedish king in full sovereignty; they still remained a part of the Germanic body, and the king of Sweden through his relation to them became a prince of the Empire and entitled to a seat in the German Diet.

The changes within the Empire were many, and some of them important. Brandenburg, the nucleus of a future great state, especially received considerable additions of territory. She got Eastern Pomerania, and also valuable ecclesiastical lands.

The articles respecting religion were even more important than those which established the metes and bounds of the different states. Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists were all put upon the same footing. Every prince, with some reservations, was to have

EUROPE
after the
PEACE OF WESTPHALIA
1648
Boundary of Empire, thus :
0 50 100 200 300 400
Scale of Miles.
Longitude West 0
Longitude East 10 from Greenwich
ATLANTIC OCEAN
North Sea
Baltic Sea
Bay of Biscay
Mediterranean Sea
NORWAY
SWEDEN
DENMARK
Copenhagen
SCOTLAND
Edinburgh
IRELAND
Dublin
ENGLAND
London
FRANCE
Paris
SPAIN
Madrid
PORTUGAL
Lisbon
GERMANY
Berlin
Vienna
Bohemia
Prague
Munich
Bavaria
Austria
Hungary
Switzerland
Bern
Zurich
Italy
Rome
Naples
Sardinia
(To Spain)
Corsica
(To Genoa)
Minorca
Majorca
Iviza
Sicily
(To Spain)
Palermo
Messina
Syracuse
Malta
(To Spain)
Tripoli
PASHALIK OF ALGIERS
PASHALIK OF TUNIS
PASHALIK OF TRIPOLI
Algiers
Tunis
Bona
Oran
(To Spain)
Ceuta
(To Spain)
Tangier
(To Portugal)
Gibraltar
(To England)
Amsterdam
Brussels
Cologne
Frankfort
Hamburg
Dresden
Leipsic
Nuremberg
Strasburg
Milan
Venice
Genoa
Florence
Naples
Lisbon
Madrid
Seville
Granada
Cadiz
Malaga
Cartagena
Valencia
Barcelona
Tarragona
Saragossa
Pampluna
Bilboa
Santander
St. Sebastian
Bordeaux
Montpensier
Toulouse
Montauban
Marseille
Nice
Toulon
Lyons
Dijon
Orleans
Rouen
Amiens
Calais
Dover
Portsmouth
Plymouth
Bristol
Oxford
Worcester
Gloucester
Liverpool
Manchester
Leeds
York
Preston
Carlisle
Newcastle
Edinburgh
Glasgow
Aberdeen
Orkney Is.
Bergen
Stockholm
Upsal
Calmar
Hellgoland
Limerick
Cork
Kinsale
Waterford
Dublin
Galway
Derry
Donegal
Brest
Rochelle
Nantes
Rennes
St. Germain
Poitiers
Richelieu
Bourges
Montpensier
Lyons
Grenoble
Chambery
Turin
Milan
Parma
Modena
Bologna
Ferrara
Venice
Ancona
Urbino
Florence
Pisa
Lucca
Genoa
Orange
Aix
Toulon
Nice
Marseille
Toulouse
Pau
Bordeaux
Bayonne
Biscay
Corunna
Oporto
Lisbon
Talavera
Toledo
Salamanca
Simancas
Valladolid
Leon
Burgos
Columbia
Arragues
Aragon
Catalonia
Valencia
Cordova
Seville
Granada
Cadiz
Malaga
Cartagena

20
30
40
50
60
Revel
Narva
Ingria
Nöteborg
Esthonia
Livonia
Riga
Courland
Novgorod
Vladimir
Nidjni Novgorod
Kasan
Moscow
RUSSIA
Smolensk
Wilna
Lithuania
POLAND
Warsaw
Cracow
Kiev
Ukrain
Pultava
Lemberg
Podolia
Zaporogian Cossacks
Don Cossacks
R. Don
R. Volga
Ural Cossacks
Astrakhan
Caspian Sea
Transylvania
Buda Pesth
Moldavia
Bender
Bessarabia
Khanate of the Crimea
Azov
Wallachia
Bucharest
Silistria
Black Sea
Nicopolis
Varna
Sofia
Philippopolis
Constantinople
Sinope
Trebizond
Kars
Erzerum
PERSIA
Adrianople
Scutari
Durazzo
Salonika
Angora
Sivas
Armenia
Van
Janina
Anatolia
Diarbekr
Lesbos
Lepanto
Chios
Smyrna
Mosul
Corinth
Athens
Aleppo
Cerigo
(To Venice)
Rhodes
Cyprus
Famagosta
Syria
Bagdad
Damascus
Crete
(To Venice)
Acre
Jaffa
Jerusalem
Damietta
Alexandria
Barka
EGYPT
Suez
Cairo
M.-N. ENG. BUFFALO.

the right to make his religion the religion of his people, and to banish all who refused to adopt the established creed; but such nonconformists were to have five years in which to emigrate. This arrangement was known as the princes' "Right of Reformation" and the subjects' "Right of Emigration." [4]

The different states of the Empire — they numbered over four hundred, counting the free imperial cities — were left almost wholly independent of the imperial authority. They were given the right to enter into alliances with one another and with foreign princes, but not, of course, against the Emperor or the Empire. This provision made the Empire merely a loose confederation, and postponed to a distant future the nationalization of the German fatherland. Germany became what Italy had been, and still was, an open field in which any enemy might sow the dragon's teeth of discord and war.

These were some of the most important provisions of the noted Peace of Westphalia. For more than two centuries they formed the fundamental law of Germany, and established a balance of power between the European states which, though it was disregarded and disturbed by Louis XIV of France, was in general maintained until the great upheaval of the French Revolution.

434. **Effects of the War upon Germany.** — It is impossible to picture the wretched condition in which the Thirty Years' War left Germany. When the struggle began, the population of the country was thirty millions; when it ended, twelve millions. Two thirds of the personal property had been destroyed. Many of the once large and flourishing cities were reduced to "mere shells." The Duchy of Würtemberg, which had half a million of inhabitants at the commencement of the war, at its close had barely fifty thousand. The once powerful Hanseatic League was virtually broken up. On every hand were the charred remains of the hovels of the peasants and the palaces of the nobility. Vast districts lay waste without an inhabitant. The very soil in many regions had reverted

[4] The history of the Palatinate illustrates the workings of this provision of the peace: in the space of sixty years the people of that principality were compelled by their successive rulers to change their religion four times. But this was an exceptional case.

to its primitive wildness. The lines of commerce were broken, and some trades and industries swept quite out of existence.

The effects upon the fine arts, upon science, learning, and morals, were even more lamentable. Painting, sculpture, and architecture had perished. The cities which had been the home of all these arts lay in ruins. Poetry had ceased to be cultivated. Education was entirely neglected. For the lifetime of a generation, men had been engaged in the business of war, and had allowed their children to grow up in absolute ignorance. Moral law was forgotten. Vice, nourished by the licentious atmosphere of the camp, reigned supreme.[5] Thus civilization in Germany, which had begun to develop with so much promise, received a check from which it did not begin to recover, so benumbed were the very senses of men, for a generation and more.

435. **Conclusion.** — The Peace of Westphalia is a prominent landmark in universal history. It stands at the dividing line of two great epochs. It marks the end of the Reformation period and the beginning of that of the Political Revolution. Henceforth, speaking broadly, men will fight for constitutions, not for creeds. We shall find them more intent on questions of civil government and of political rights than on questions of Church government and of religious dogmas. We shall not often see one nation attacking another, or one party in a nation assaulting another party, on account of a difference in religious opinion.[6]

But in setting the Peace of Westphalia to mark the end of the Era of the Reformation, we do not mean to convey the idea that men had come to embrace the beneficent doctrine of religious toleration. As a matter of fact, no real toleration had yet been reached, — nothing save the semblance of toleration. The long

[5] Before the close of the war the number of camp followers on both sides had come to exceed that of the fighting men. When on the march the armies resembled the migratory hordes of Goths and Vandals that overran the Roman Empire. After the war the disbanded soldiers became thieves and brigands, and thousands were executed. Germany was pestered by these marauding bands for a full century after the conclusion of the Peace of Westphalia.

[6] The Puritan Revolution in England may look like a religious war, but we shall learn that it was primarily a political contest, — a struggle against despotism in the state.

conflict of a century and more, and the vicissitudes of fortune, which to-day gave one party the power of the persecutor and to-morrow made the same sect the victims of persecution, had simply forced all to the practical conclusion that they must tolerate one another, — that one sect must not attempt to put another down by force. But it has required the broadening and liberalizing lessons of the two centuries and over that have since passed to bring men to see, even in part, that the thing they *must* do is the very thing they *ought* to do, — to make men tolerant not only in outward conduct but in spirit.

With this single word of caution we now pass to the study of the Era of the Political Revolution, a period characterized in particular by the growth of divine-right kingship and by the great struggle between despotic and liberal principles of government.

Selections from the Sources. — The student will do well to begin his study of the Thirty Years' War by a careful reading of *Historical Leaflets* (Crozer Theological Seminary), No. 5, "The Peace of Augsburg." He will here learn how deep-seated and irreconcilable were the differences which divided the religious parties in Germany.

Secondary Works. — GINDELY, *History of the Thirty Years' War*. The best history for English readers. Chaps. x and xi of vol. ii, bearing upon the peace negotiations, are of special interest. FLETCHER, *Gustavus Adolphus and the Struggle of Protestantism for Existence*. GARDINER, *The Thirty Years' War*. HENDERSON, *A Short History of Germany*, vol. i, chaps. xvii and xviii. BRYCE, *The Holy Roman Empire*, chaps. xviii and xix. FISHER, *History of the Reformation*, chap. xv, summarizes from the Protestant side the results of the Reformation; BALMES, *European Civilization; Protestantism and Catholicism compared*, and SPAULDING, *The History of the Protestant Reformation*, Parts I and II, contain discussions of the subject from the Catholic point of view.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Articles of the Peace of Augsburg, the violation of which caused trouble. 2. Outlawry of the free city of Donauwörth. 3. Wallenstein. 4. Tilly and the sack of Magdeburg. 5. Pictures of Germany at the end of the war.

FOURTH PERIOD — THE ERA OF THE POLITICAL REVOLUTION

(From the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648, to the Twentieth Century)

I. THE AGE OF ABSOLUTE MONARCHY: THE PRELUDE TO THE POLITICAL REVOLUTION (1648–1789)

CHAPTER XXVI

INTRODUCTORY: THE DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINE RIGHT OF KINGS AND THE MAXIMS OF THE ENLIGHTENED DESPOTS

436. The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings. — Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there was widely held a theory of government which during that period probably had as great an influence upon the historical development in Europe as the theory of the Empire and the Papacy exerted during the Middle Ages. This theory is known as the Divine Right of Kings.[1]

According to this theory, the nation is a great family with the king as its divinely appointed head. The duty of the king is to govern like a father; the duty of the people is to obey their king even as children obey their parents. If the king does wrong, is cruel, unjust, this is simply the misfortune of his people; under no circumstances is it right for them to rebel against his authority,

[1] It was in England and in France that the theory was most logically developed, and it was in these countries that it exerted its greatest influence upon the political evolution.

any more than for children to rise against their father. The king is responsible to God alone, and to God the people, quietly submissive, must leave the avenging of all their wrongs.

This conception of government is so different from our idea of it that it will be worth our while to listen to two of the ablest champions of the doctrine while they more fully expound it.

According to the first of these the family is the germ and prototype of the state. "If we compare the natural rights of a father with those of a king," — it is the old English writer Filmer who speaks,[2] — "we find them all one, without any difference at all but only in the latitude or extent of them: as the father over one family, so the king, as father over many families, extends his care to preserve, feed, clothe, instruct, and defend the whole commonwealth. His war, his peace, his courts of justice, and all his acts of sovereignty tend only to preserve and distribute to every subordinate and inferior father, and to their children, their rights and privileges, so that all the duties of a king are summed up in an universal fatherly care of his people."

Heredity points out the legitimate king: "It is unnatural for the multitude to choose their governors, or to govern or to partake in the government."

The power of the hereditary king is absolute: "For as kingly power is by the law of God, so it hath no inferior law to limit it."

The king can neither be corrected nor deposed by his subjects: "For, indeed, it is the rule of Solomon that 'We must keep the king's commandment,' and not say, 'What dost thou?' because 'where the word of a king is there is power,' and all that he pleaseth he will do. . . . Not that it is right for kings to do injury, but it is right for them to go unpunished by the people if they do it. . . . It will be punishment sufficient for them to expect God as a revenger." [3]

[2] In his *Patriarcha*. See Sources at end of chapter.

[3] Filmer is here quoting the words of the celebrated English jurist Bracton (d. 1268). All that the people can do when the king misuses his authority is to petition him "to amend his fault" — and "to pray to God."

"Kings are the ministers of God" — it is the eloquent Bossuet, the court chaplain of Louis XIV, who now speaks [4] — "and his vicegerents on the earth." "The throne of a king is not the throne of a man, but the throne of God himself. . . . The person of kings is sacred, and it is sacrilege to harm them." [5] "They are gods, and partake in some fashion of the divine independence." [6]

With Filmer, Bossuet maintains the subject's duty of passive obedience. He who does not obey his prince is worthy of death as the enemy of society. Rebellion against kings is sacrilege: "The holy anointment is on them and the high office they exercise in the name of God protects them from all insult."

At first the upholders of this theory of the nature and powers of the kingly office were apt to seek support for it in biblical texts; but later its defenders came to rely more on pure argument, as is illustrated by Filmer's syllogism: "What is natural to man exists by divine right; kingship is natural to man; therefore, kingship exists by divine right." [7]

Before the close of the period upon which we here enter, we shall see how this theory of the divine right of kings worked out in practice, — how dear it cost both kings and people, and how the people by the strong logic of revolution demonstrated that they have a divine and inalienable right to govern themselves.[8]

437. History of the Doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings. — This theory that kings rule by divine right has a history well

[4] In his *Politique tirée des propres paroles de l' Écriture Sainte* (Œuvres complètes, vol. xxiii, Paris, 1875), p. 533.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 534. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 559. See Psalms lxxxii. 6.

[7] See Figgis, *The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings*, p. 153.

[8] There was much in the history of the Middle Ages to convince men that absolute monarchy, if not a divinely appointed form of government, was at least the best form. Every other form had been tried and found wanting, having issued either in tyranny or in anarchy. Witness the intolerable oppression of the aristocratic government of the feudal lords; witness the tyranny of the theocratic government of the priesthood; witness the turbulence of society under the democratic régime of the Italian cities. Peace and security within the state had been secured only through the growth of the royal power. Hence the political axiom of this age, an age just escaping from feudal anarchy, was that of the Homeric Greeks, — "The rule of many is not a good thing; let there be one leader only, one king."

worth tracing. Among primitive peoples, like the early Greeks, we find the king ruling by divine right, — by right of his descent from the gods. In Egypt the Pharaoh was regarded as partaking of the divine nature. In ancient Judea the king was the Lord's anointed, and ruled as his vicegerent on earth. In the days of the Roman emperors their subjects in the East were prone to regard the head of the Empire as set apart from ordinary men. They built temples in honor of "the divine Cæsar."

But to trace the origin of the doctrine as applied to kings of modern times, we need not go farther back than to the establishment of the mediæval Papacy. The popes, as we have learned, ruled by what may be termed divine right. All acknowledged their office and authority to be of divine origin and appointment. But when the emperors of German origin got into controversy with the popes in regard to the relation of the imperial to the papal power, then it was that the supporters of the emperors framed the counter-theory of the divine origin of the imperial authority. Thus Dante in his *De Monarchia* argues for the supernatural character of the imperial power, and maintains that the Emperor rules as much by divine right as does the Pope. Then later in the fourteenth century, after the Empire had been practically destroyed by the Papacy and the kings had taken up the fight against the papal see, their supporters naturally began to preach the doctrine of the divine nature of the royal authority. This was the starting point of the theory in its modern form.

When finally the Reformation came and with it even still keener strife between the lay rulers of the revolted nations and the Roman see, then the theory of the divine nature of the royal power received perforce a great expansion. For when the Pope excommunicated a heretic king and exhorted his subjects to take up arms against him, then the royalist writers and preachers proclaimed more loudly than ever and with passionate fervor the doctrine of the divine right of princes and the wickedness of disobedience and rebellion. Fostered in this way, the doctrine of the sacred character of kingship and the virtue of passive obedience in the subject struck deep and firm root.

438. Character of the Absolute Sovereigns and their Relation to the Political Revolution. — What use did the kings make of the vast and unlimited authority with which the circumstances of history and the growth of political theory had invested them? As a class, they made a betrayal of the great trust. Too many of them acted upon the maxim of Louis XIV of France, — "Self-aggrandizement is at once the noblest and the most agreeable occupation of kings." They seemed to think that their subjects were made for their use; that the public strength and the public revenues might be freely used by them for the attainment of purely personal ends, the promotion of purely personal ambitions. War became a royal pastime. A great part of the bloody wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which centuries may be regarded as covering roughly the age of absolute monarchy, were wars that originated in frivolous personal jealousies, in wicked royal ambitions, or in disputes respecting dynastic succession. So generally did the wars of this period spring from questions of the latter nature, that by some historians the age is called the Era of Dynastic Wars.[9] The teachings of the *The Prince* of Machiavelli ruled the period.

Now, all this misuse of royal power, all these unholy wars with their trains of attendant evils, did much to discredit divine-right kingship and to bring in government by the people. "Bad kings help us," Emerson affirms, "if only they are bad enough." Many of the kings of this period were bad enough to be supremely helpful to us. It was during this age of the kings that the forces set loose by the Renaissance and the Reformation engendered the tempest which overwhelmed forever divine-right kingship and its gilded appendage of privileged aristocracy.

[9] There is need of caution here, however. Not all the wars of this age were frivolous, artificial, or personal. There were, as we shall see, wars involving great issues and principles, — questions of systems of government and forms of civilization. The war in England between the Parliament and the king was the first act in the drama of the Political Revolution; and the Seven Years' War (1756–1763) was a struggle involving as momentous questions as were ever arbitrated by the sword. Commercial and colonial interests too were coming to be more generally the concern of governments, and some of the greatest wars of the eighteenth century had their origin in national jealousies touching trade and colonies.

439. The Enlightened Despots. — But not all the kings of this age were imbecile or wicked. There were among them many wise and benevolent rulers. Especially during the latter part of the eighteenth century did there appear monarchs known as the Enlightened Despots, who, under the influence of the teachings of French philosophy, came to entertain reasonable views of their duties and of their obligations to their subjects.

These sovereigns did not give up the idea that unlimited monarchy is the best form of government and that the people should have no part in public affairs. They sincerely believed that the power of the king should be unlimited, but they emphasized the doctrine that this power should be exercised solely in the interest of the people. The public revenues should be expended on public works, and public officials should be appointed solely on the ground of their ability and fitness. Thus the idea of the royal power being a trust, the royal office a stewardship, was made prominent. The king became the servant of his people.

The great place which the rulers of this disposition held in the history of the century immediately preceding the French Revolution is indicated by these words of the historian Professor H. Morse Stephens: "The most characteristic feature in government of the eighteenth century," he says, "was the existence and the work of the enlightened despots."

Most prominent among the sovereigns deemed worthy a place among the enlightened despots are Catherine the Great of Russia, Frederick the Great of Prussia, and Joseph II of Austria. Concerning them and their work we shall have something to say in following chapters. It will suffice here if we simply observe that the issue of this great experiment in government illustrated anew what had been demonstrated by the rule of the Tyrants in the cities of ancient Greece, and by that of the Cæsars at Rome, — namely, that absolute power cannot safely be lodged in the hands of a single person. It is certain sooner or later to be misused.

As it has been well put, absolute power in a single person is a good thing when joined with perfect wisdom and perfect goodness. But unfortunately these qualifications of the ideal autocrat

are seldom found united in the same individual, and still less seldom are they transmitted from father to son. It is at just this point that absolute hereditary monarchy, as a practical form of government, breaks down beyond hope and without remedy.

Selections from the Sources. — FILMER, *Patriarcha.* This work, which was first published in 1680, is the classical English treatise in exposition and defense of divine-right kingship. For a short selection from KING JAMES, *Law of Free Monarchies*, see LEE, *Source-Book*, pp. 337, 338.

Secondary Works. — FIGGIS, *The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings.* An able and interesting discussion of the subject. The book has a good bibliography. GAIRDNER and SPEDDING, *Studies in English History;* contains a valuable essay entitled, "The Divine Right of Kings: History of the Doctrine." This essay is a reprint of an article by Dr. Gairdner in *The Contemporary Review* for September, 1869. STEPHENS, *Syllabus of Lectures on Modern European History*, Lect. li, "The Enlightened Despots"; suggests important viewpoints.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The deification of the Roman emperors. 2. Dante's argument in his *De Monarchia* for the supernatural character of the imperial office. 3. The reforms of the enlightened despots. See *Stephens.*

CHAPTER XXVII

THE ASCENDANCY OF FRANCE UNDER LOUIS XIV (1643–1715)

440. Louis XIV as the Typical Divine-Right King. — Louis XIV of France stands as the representative of divine-right monarchy. He shall himself expound to us his conception of government.[1] These are his words: "To attribute to subjects the right of forming resolutions and of giving commands to their sovereign is to pervert the true order of things. It is to the head alone that pertains the right to deliberate and to resolve upon; the whole duty of subjects consists in the carrying into effect of the commands given them." [2] "Kings are absolute lords; to them belongs naturally the full and free disposal of all the property of their subjects, whether they be churchmen or laymen." [3] "For subjects to rise against their prince, however wicked and oppressive he may be, is always infinitely criminal. God, who has given kings to men, has willed that they should be revered as his lieutenants, and has reserved to Himself alone the right to review their conduct. His will is that he who is born a subject should obey without question." [4]

The doctrine here set forth Louis is said to have expressed in this terser form: *L'État c'est moi*, "I am the State." He may

[1] It should be noted that Louis' subjects, at least the great majority of them, also believed in government by one, — and not without reason. They had had sorry experience with government by many, under the régime of the nobles. Of government by all, by themselves, it was not possible for them to have any clear conception, if any conception at all. It needed a hundred years and more of autocratic misrule and oppression to call into existence that revolutionary idea.

[2] *Œuvres de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1806), tome ii, p. 26.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 121. Louis adds, however, that what kings take from their subjects they should use as wise stewards, — that is to say, for the promotion of the public welfare.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 336.

never have uttered these exact words, but the famous epigram at least embodies perfectly his ideas of kingship. In his own view he was by divine commission the sole legislator, judge, and executive of the French nation.

This theory of government thus expounded by Louis was indeed, as we have seen, no novel doctrine to the Europe of the seventeenth century; but Louis was such an ideal autocrat that somehow he made autocratic government attractive. Other rulers imitated him, and it became the prevailing theory that kings have a "divine right" to rule, and that the people should have no part at all in government.

441. **The Administration of Mazarin** (1643–1661). — The religious war in Germany was still in progress when, in 1643, Louis XIII died, leaving the vast authority which his great minister Cardinal Richelieu had done so much to consolidate, as an inheritance to his little son Louis, a child of five years.

During the prince's minority the government was in the hands of his mother, Anne of Austria, as regent. She chose as her chief minister an Italian ecclesiastic, Cardinal Mazarin, who in his administration of affairs followed in the footsteps of his predecessor, Richelieu, carrying out with great ability the comprehensive policy of that minister. France was encouraged to maintain her part — and a very glorious part it was, as war goes — in the Thirty Years' War until Austria was completely exhausted and all Germany indeed almost ruined. Even after the Peace of Westphalia, which simply concluded the war in Germany, France carried on the war with Spain for ten years longer, until 1659, when the Treaty of the Pyrenees, which gave the French the two provinces of Roussillon and Artois, together with a part of Flanders, asserted the triumph of France over Spain. Richelieu's policy had at last, though at terrible cost to France,[5] been

[5] The heavy taxes laid to meet the expenses of the wars created great discontent, which during the struggle with Spain led to a series of conspiracies or revolts against the government, known as the Wars of the Fronde (1648–1652). This was a dying effort on the part of the nobles, the hereditary magistrates, and the middle classes to curb the growing power of the crown. The movement lacked seriousness and true leadership, and resulted only in making more oppressive the absolutism against which it was directed.

crowned with success. The House of Austria in both its branches had been humiliated and crippled, and the House of Bourbon was ready to assume the lead in European affairs.

442. Louis XIV assumes the Government. — Cardinal Mazarin died in 1661. Upon this event Louis, who was now twenty-three years of age, called together the heads of the various departments of the government, and, directing his words to the Chancellor, said: "I have summoned you with my ministers and secretaries of state, to tell you that it has pleased me hitherto to leave my affairs in the hands of the late cardinal; in the future I shall attend to them myself. You will give me your counsel when I ask for it." He then charged the Chancellor not to set seal to any document without his express orders; and warned the secretaries not to sign any paper, not even a passport, without his express commands.

FIG. 75. — LOUIS XIV. (After a painting by *Philippe de Champagne*)

From this time on for more than half a century Louis was his own prime minister. He gave personal attention to every matter, even the most trivial. Probably no wearer of a crown, Philip II of Spain possibly excepted, ever worked harder at "the trade of a king," as he himself designated his employment. He had able men about him, but they planned and worked — and sometimes chafed — under his minute directions and tireless superintendence.

443. Louis' Chief Aims. — The history of Louis' long reign will present coherence and unity only as we fix clearly in view the

ends towards which his efforts were mainly directed. His first aim was to make himself absolute master in his own kingdom. In his "Instructions to the Dauphin" he says, "The necessary basis of all other reforms was the rendering of my own will absolute." This basis was well laid. Under Louis there was but one will in France, — the will of the king. The nobility, the States-General, all local authorities, the Parliament of Paris,[6] the Church, — all these classes and bodies were shorn of the last remnants of political influence and power and rendered servilely submissive to the crown.

Louis' second aim was to secure for France the headship of Europe, — to transfer European leadership and the imperial crown itself from the House of Hapsburg to the House of Bourbon. We shall see in how many sanguinary wars Louis involved almost all Europe in his efforts to realize this object of his ambition.

444. **Colbert.** — Mazarin is reported to have said to Louis when dying, "Sire, I owe everything to you; but I pay my debt to your majesty by giving you Colbert." During the first ten or twelve years of Louis' personal reign this extraordinary man inspired and directed almost everything; but he carefully avoided the appearance of doing so. His maxim seemed to be, Mine the labor, thine the praise. He did for the domestic affairs of France what Richelieu had done for the foreign.

So long as Louis followed the policy of Colbert, he gave France a truly glorious reign; but unfortunately he soon turned aside from the great minister's policy of peace, to seek glory for himself and greatness for France through new and unjust encroachments upon neighboring nations.

445. **The Wars of Louis XIV.** — During the period of his personal administration of the government, Louis XIV was engaged

[6] This was a French court of justice which attempted to assume political functions, — which sometimes seemed to aspire to become for France what the English Parliament was for England. One of its duties was to register the royal edicts, which were given validity only by such registration. Sometimes the court hesitated to register the king's decrees, and made remonstrances. Louis ordained that the court should register all decrees without delay. It might make remonstrances afterwards. The court was forced to bow to the royal will.

CENTRAL EUROPE 1660
German Empire
Austrian
Brandenburg
Spanish
Swedish
Danish
French
Savoyard
English
L.L.POATES, ENGR., N.Y.

in four great wars: (1) a war respecting the Spanish Netherlands (1667–1668); (2) a war with the Protestant Netherlands (1672–1678); (3) the War of the Palatinate, or of the League of Augsburg (1688–1697); and (4) the War of the Spanish Succession (1701–1714). All these wars were, on the part of the French monarch, wars of conquest and aggression, or wars provoked by his ambitious and encroaching policy. The most inveterate enemy of Louis during all this period was the Dutch Republic, the representative and champion of liberty.

446. **The War concerning the Spanish Netherlands** (1667–1668). — Upon the death in 1665 of Philip IV of Spain, Louis laid claim, in the name of his wife,[7] to portions of the Spanish Netherlands and led an army into the country. The Hollanders were naturally alarmed, fearing that Louis would also want to annex their country to his dominions. Accordingly they effected what was called the Triple Alliance with England and Sweden, checked the French king in his career of conquest, and, by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1668, forced him to give up much of the territory he had seized. He retained, however, a number of Flemish towns along the French frontier, which he made by extensive fortifications, planned by his celebrated military engineer Vauban, the strong outposts of his kingdom in that direction.

447. **The War with the Protestant Netherlands** (1672–1678). — The second war of the French king was against the United Netherlands. His attack upon this little state was prompted by a variety of motives. In the first place, the Hollanders' intervention in the preceding war had stirred his resentment. Then these Dutchmen represented everything to which he was opposed, — self-government, Protestantism, and free thought.

Before entering upon the undertaking which had proved too great for Philip II with the resources of two worlds at his command, Louis, by means of bribes and the employment of that skillful diplomacy of which he was so perfect a master, prudently

[7] Maria Theresa, the only child of Philip IV *by his first marriage*. At the time of her betrothal to Louis she had renounced all her rights in the Netherlands, but since a promised dowry had never been paid, Louis argued that this renunciation was void.

drew away from the side of Holland both her allies (Sweden and England), even inducing the English king, Charles II, to lend him active assistance. Money also secured the aid of several of the princes of Germany.

Thus the little commonwealth was left alone to contend against fearful odds. The stubborn resistance offered the invading French armies by the Hollanders in their half-drowned land, — with the French threatening Amsterdam, the dikes had been cut, — the havoc wrought by the stout Dutch sailors among the fleets of the allies, and the diplomacy of the Dutch statesmen, who through skillful negotiations detached almost all the allies of the French from that side and brought them into alliance with the Republic, — all these things soon put a very different face upon affairs, and Louis found himself confronted by the armies of half of Europe.

For several years the war was now waged on land and sea, — in the Netherlands, all along the Rhine, upon the English Channel, in the Mediterranean, and on the coasts of the New World. Finally, an end was put to the struggle by the Peace of Nimeguen (1678). Louis gave up his conquests in Holland, but kept a large number of towns and fortresses in the Spanish Netherlands, besides the free county of Burgundy (Franche-Comté), on his eastern frontier.

Thus Louis came out of this tremendous struggle, in which half of Europe was leagued against him, with enhanced reputation and fresh acquisitions of territory. People began to call him the "Grand Monarch"; we shall see directly by what acts he justified their judgment in conferring upon him this title.

448. **Louis seizes the City of Strasburg** (1681). — Ten years of comparative peace now followed for Western Europe. Among the many indefensible acts of Louis during this period there were two which deserve special notice, since, while marking the culmination of Louis' power and illustrating his arrogant and unjust use of that power, they also mark the turning point in his fortunes.

The first of these was the seizure of the free city of Strasburg and a score of other important places on the left bank of the

Rhine belonging to the Empire. "Gold, intrigue, and terror" opened the gates of all these cities to him.[8] Strasburg was of supreme military importance to Louis on account of her strong fortifications, which rendered her mistress of the Rhine.

The audacity of Louis' procedure so dazed every one that no effective protest was made. Besides, at just this time the Emperor was preoccupied with the Turks. In 1683 they laid siege to Vienna. All Christendom awaited anxiously the outcome. Fortunately the siege was raised by the celebrated Polish king, John Sobieski, and the House of Austria was saved. But the Turks continued to threaten the eastern territories of Austria, so that it was impossible for the Emperor to intervene in any effective way to prevent Louis from consummating his schemes for the absorption of the Rhenish lands which he needed to round out his dominions in that quarter.

449. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685). — The second act to which we refer — an act the injustice of which was only equaled by its folly — was the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the gracious decree by which Henry IV guaranteed religious freedom to the French Protestants (sec. 423).

Louis' motives in persecuting his Protestant subjects were essentially the same as those which had led Philip III of Spain to expel from his dominions his Morisco subjects. He believed the extirpation of heresy to be a service pleasing to God, and he coveted the honor of rooting it out of France.

The revocation of the edict was not the result of a sudden resolve. Almost from the beginning of his personal rule Louis had shown a persecuting spirit. He had placed unfair construction upon the clauses of the edict and had subjected the Huguenots to many annoying restrictions. Since 1683 he had harassed them by a device known as the "Dragonnades," from the circumstance that dragoons were quartered upon the Protestant families, with full permission to annoy and persecute them in every way "short of violation and death," to the end that the

[8] To lend a color of legality to his acts, Louis, before making these seizures, had had his claims to them passed upon by courts known as "Chambers of Reunion."

victims of these outrages might be constrained to recant, which multitudes did.

The fateful royal decree revoking the edict of toleration was issued in 1685. By this cruel measure all the Protestant churches were closed, and every Huguenot who refused to embrace the Catholic faith was outlawed. The ministers of the heretical sect were expelled from the kingdom; laymen, on the other hand, were forbidden to leave the country. Any one attempting to do so, if apprehended, was to be sent to the galleys for life.

Disregarding the royal prohibition and evading the vigilance of the police, great numbers of the persecuted Huguenots made their way out of the country. It is estimated that before the end of the seventeenth century Louis had lost as many as three hundred thousand of the most skillful and industrious of his subjects.

The effects upon France of the exodus were most disastrous. Several of the most important and flourishing of the French industries were ruined, while the manufacturing interests of other countries, particularly those of the Protestant Netherlands, England, and Brandenburg, were correspondingly benefited by the energy, skill, and capital which the exiles carried to them. Many of the fugitive Huguenots ultimately found new homes in remote South Africa, and their descendants contributed greatly to the strength of the republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. Many others sought refuge in America; and no other class of emigrants, save the Puritans of England, cast

> Such healthful leaven 'mid the elements
> That peopled the new world.[9]

450. The War of the Palatinate, or of the League of Augsburg (1688–1697). — The indirect results of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes were quite as calamitous to France as were the direct results. The indignation that the measure awakened among the Protestant nations contributed to enable William of Orange to organize a formidable confederacy against Louis, known as the League of Augsburg (1686).

[9] See Baird, *History of the Huguenot Emigration to America.*

Louis resolved to attack the confederates. Seeking a pretext for beginning hostilities, he laid claim, on the part of his sister-in-law, to properties in the Palatinate, and hurried a large army into the country, which was quickly overrun. But being unable to hold the conquests he had made, Louis ordered that the country be laid waste. Among the places reduced to ruins were the historic towns of Heidelberg, Spires, and Worms. Even fruit trees, vines, and crops were destroyed. Upwards of a hundred thousand peasants were rendered homeless.

Another and more formidable coalition, known as the Grand Alliance, was now formed against Louis (1689). It embraced England, Holland, Sweden, Spain, Savoy, the Emperor, the Elector Palatine, and the Electors of Bavaria and Saxony.

For ten years almost all Europe was a great battlefield. It was very much such a struggle as that waged a century later by the allied monarchies of Europe against Napoleon, when they fought for the independence of the continent.

Both sides at length becoming weary of the contest and almost exhausted in resources, the struggle was closed by the Peace of Ryswick (1697). There was a mutual surrender of conquests made during the course of the war, and Louis had also to give up many of the places he had seized before the beginning of the conflict. He managed, however, to retain, along with some other places, the important city of Strasburg.

451. **War of the Spanish Succession** (1701–1714). — Barely three years had passed after the Peace of Ryswick before the great powers of Europe were involved in another war, known as the War of the Spanish Succession.

The proximate circumstances out of which the war grew were these. In 1700 the king of Spain, Charles II, the last male descendant in Spain of the great Emperor Charles V, died, leaving his crown — the disposition of which had been made a matter of endless discussion and infinite intrigue, for Charles was childless — to Philip, Duke of Anjou, a grandson of Louis XIV. The duke, a mere lad of seventeen years, assumed the bequeathed crown with the title of Philip V, and thus became the founder of the

Bourbon dynasty in Spain. "There are no longer any Pyrenees," is the way in which Louis is reported to have expressed his exultation over this virtual union of France and Spain.

France, through Spanish favor, might also now easily become supreme in the colonial world and realize her dream of a great colonial empire. The common danger led to the forming of a second Grand Alliance [10] against France, a main object of which was to eject Philip from the Spanish throne and to seat thereon the Archduke Charles of Austria, the second son of the Emperor Leopold I.[11] The two greatest generals of the allies were the Duke of Marlborough (John Churchill), the ablest commander, except Wellington perhaps, that England has ever produced, and Prince Eugene of Savoy, who was in the imperial service.

FIG. 76. — DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH. (After a painting by *F. Kneller*)

For thirteen years all Europe was shaken with war. During the progress of the struggle were fought some of the most memorable battles in European history, — Blenheim, Ramillies, Oudenarde, and Malplaquet, — in all of which the genius of Marlborough and the consummate skill of Prince Eugene won splendid victories for the allies.

In the year 1711, a vacancy having occurred in the imperial office, the Archduke Charles was elected Emperor. This changed the whole aspect of the Spanish question, for now to place Charles upon the Spanish throne would be to give him a dangerous preponderance of power; would be, in fact, to reëstablish the great

[10] The alliance embraced at first England, the Protestant Netherlands, Austria, and other German states, and later was joined by Portugal and Savoy.

[11] It was not, however, until the second year of the alliance that the powers formally acknowledged the archduke as king of Spain.

monarchy of Charles V. Consequently the Grand Alliance, already weakened from other causes, fell to pieces, and the war was ended by the treaties of Utrecht (1713) and Rastadt (1714).

By the provisions of these treaties the Bourbon prince, Philip of Anjou, was left upon the Spanish throne, but on the condition that there should never be a union of the French and Spanish crowns upon the same head. His dominions also were pared away on every side. Gibraltar and the island of Minorca were ceded to England; Milan, Naples, the island of Sardinia, and the Catholic Netherlands were given to Austria; and Sicily to the Duke of Savoy. Spain was thus shorn of nearly half her territories in Europe.

France also suffered in her colonial possessions and claims, being forced to cede Nova Scotia (Acadia) to England and to admit her sovereignty over Newfoundland and the Hudson Bay Territory.[12]

452. **New France under Louis XIV.** — In examining the main articles of the treaties which closed the War of the Spanish Succession, one cannot fail to be impressed by the revelation of how decisively the New World was at that time beginning to react upon the Old. Indeed, from the opening of the eighteenth century forward the affairs of America were destined to become constantly more and more closely intertwined with those of Europe, so much so as regards France and England that their respective histories in the eighteenth century can be read aright only in the light of these new relations. We shall therefore do well if we here turn our eyes from following the course of events in Europe and cast a glance upon the situation of things in the New World.

Louis had dreams of a splendid French empire beyond the seas. With such paternal solicitude did he watch over the growth of the French transatlantic settlements that he earned the title of "Father of New France."[13] Year after year shiploads of emigrants were

[12] For the celebrated clause concerning the "Assiento," see sec. 531.

[13] Asia was not forgotten. The French established themselves at Surat, in India, in 1667, and at Pondicherry in 1672. To encourage the nobles to engage in colonial trade, Louis issued an edict ordaining that it should not be regarded as "derogatory to the nobility to take part in commerce with the Indies."

sent out at the expense of the crown. The population along the St. Lawrence thickened slowly yet steadily, and a chain of forts and settlements was formed stretching from the Great Lakes along the Ohio and the Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico.

But several things intervened to prevent Louis from becoming the maker of a great and permanent French empire in America. In the first place, he subordinated these over-the-sea interests to his ambitious European policy. Hence the resources which should have been used in fostering colonial enterprises were wasted in unjust and comparatively fruitless wars at home.

In the second place, the French colony in Canada never grew and gained in strength in the way that the English settlements did, because the French settlers never breathed the air of liberty. They were allowed no initiative; everything was planned and executed for them. They were treated like children. This paternalism smothered all worthy individual aspiration and enterprise.

In the third place, the unfortunate bigotry of Louis and of his advisers stood in the way of the success of the undertaking. The colony was closed against all save Catholic immigrants. This was a suicidal policy. Had the French territories, like the English colonies, been open to religious dissenters, New France would doubtless have received a large and steady stream of Huguenot emigrants, and therewith such an accession of strength as might possibly have given a wholly different issue to the great struggle which, soon after Louis had passed from the stage, began between the English and the French for supremacy in America.

453. **Death of the King** (1715). — It was amidst troubles, perplexities, and afflictions that Louis XIV's long and eventful reign drew to a close. The heavy and constant taxes necessary to meet the expenses of his numerous wars, to maintain an extravagant court, and to furnish means for the erection of costly buildings, had bankrupted the country, and the cries of his wretched subjects, clamoring for bread, could not be shut out of the royal chamber. Death, too, had invaded the palace, striking down the Dauphin and also two grandsons of Louis, leaving as the nearest heir to the throne his great-grandson, a mere child. On the

morning of Sept. 1, 1715, the Grand Monarch breathed his last, bequeathing to this boy of five years a kingdom overwhelmed with debt, and filled with misery, with threatening vices, and dangerous discontent. He seemed at the last moment to be sensible of the mistakes and faults of his reign, for his dying charge to the little prince who was to succeed him was as follows: "Do not follow the bad example which I have set you. I have undertaken war too lightly, and have continued it from vanity. Do not imitate me, but be a pacific prince, and let your chief occupation be to relieve your subjects."

The tidings of the king's death, instead of being received by his subjects with tears, was received throughout France with an outburst of rejoicing. A satirist of the time declared that "the people had shed too many tears during his life to have any left for his death."

454. **The Court of Louis XIV.** — The court of the Grand Monarch was the most extravagantly magnificent that Europe has ever seen. Never since Nero spread his Golden House over the burnt district of Rome and ensconcing himself amid its luxurious appointments exclaimed, "Now I am housed as a man ought to be," had prince or king so ostentatiously lavished upon himself the wealth of an empire. Louis had half a dozen palaces, the most costly of which was that at Versailles. Here he created, in what was originally a desert, a beautiful miniature universe of which he was the center, the resplendent sun — he chose the sun as his emblem — around which all revolved and from which all received light and life. Upon the central building and its adjuncts he spent fabulous sums, — what would probably be equal to more than a hundred million dollars with us. Here were gathered the beauty, wit, and learning of France. The royal household numbered over fifteen thousand persons, all living in costly and luxurious idleness at the expense of the people.

One element of this enormous family was the great lords of the old feudal aristocracy. Dispossessed of their ancient power and wealth, they were content now to fill a place in the royal household, — to be the king's pensioners and the elegant embellishment

of his court. "A military staff on a furlough for a century or more, around a commander-in-chief who gives fashionable entertainments, is," says Taine, "the principle and summary of the habits of society under the ancient régime."

As can easily be imagined, the court life of this period was shamefully corrupt. Vice, however, was gilded. The most scandalous immoralities were made attractive by the glitter of superficial accomplishment and by exquisite suavity



FIG. 77. — VIEW OF VERSAILLES. (From a photograph)

and polish of manner. But, notwithstanding its insincerity and immorality, the brilliancy of the court of Louis dazzled all Europe. The neighboring courts imitated its manners and emulated its extravagances. In all matters of taste and fashion France gave laws to the continent, and the French language became the court language of the civilized world.

455. **Literature under Louis XIV.** — Although Louis himself was not much of a scholar, he gave a most liberal encouragement to men of letters, thereby making his reign the Augustan Age of French literature. In this patronage Louis was not unselfish. He honored and befriended poets and writers of every class, because thus he extended the reputation of his court. These writers, pensioners of his bounty, filled all Europe with praises of the great king, and thus made the most ample and grateful return to Louis for his favor and liberality.

Almost every species of literature was cultivated by the French writers of this era, yet it was in the province of the drama that the most eminent names appeared. The three great names here are those of Corneille (1606–1684), Racine (1639–1699), and Molière (1622–1673). Corneille and Racine were writers of tragedy; Molière was a writer of comedy. Corneille is called the "Father of French Tragedy." [14]

456. **Relation of the Reign of Louis XIV to the Revolution of 1789.** — "If it be asked," says the historian Von Holst, "who did the most towards the destruction of the ancient régime, the correct answer is, beyond all question, Louis XIV, its greatest representative." Louis discredited absolute monarchy by his shameful misuse of his unlimited power. His many wars and his extravagant expenditures on an idle and profligate court weighed France down with crushing and intolerable burdens. It was the vast mass of misery and suffering created by his acting on the monstrous doctrine that "the many are made for the use of one," that did much to prepare the minds and hearts of the French people for the great Revolution.

457. **Decline of the French Monarchy under Louis XV** (1715–1774). — The supremacy of the House of Bourbon passed away forever with Louis XIV. In passing from the reign of the Grand Monarch to that of his successor, we pass from the strongest and outwardly most brilliant reign in French history to the weakest and most humiliating. Louis XV was a despot without possessing any of the possible virtues of a despot. During his reign the French nation made a swift descent towards the abyss of the Revolution of 1789.

[14] Among other world-renowned French writers, philosophers, prelates, and orators who adorned the age of Louis XIV were Descartes (1596–1650), the father of modern philosophy; Pascal (1623–1662), the prodigy in mathematics and the author of the famous *Provincial Letters;* La Bruyère (1645–1696), novelist and unrivaled depicter of character and manners; Madame de Sévigné (1626–1696), the brilliant letter writer, whose correspondence forms to-day a prized portion of French literature and constitutes a treasure of information for the court historian; Bossuet (1627–1704), the eloquent court preacher and champion of divine-right kingship; and Fénelon (1651–1715), the distinguished prelate and author of *The Adventures of Telemachus*, a disguised satire on the reign of Louis XIV.

For the first eight years of the reign affairs were in the hands of the Duke of Orleans, who was regent during the king's minority. He was a corrupt man, a man absolutely shameless in his vices. Probably Rome in the days of the worst Cæsars witnessed nothing in the way of reckless and riotous living to surpass what France witnessed under what is known as the Regency.

A celebrated episode of this period was the financial experiment of John Law, a Scotchman who had gained the ear of the regent. His system involved the creation of a bank and the formation of a gigantic trading association known as the Mississippi Company. The government lent its credit to the bank, and granted the company for settlement the territory of Louisiana, the vast indefinite region in North America opened up to French enterprise by the explorations of La Salle. France now went wild in a fever of speculation. Rumors were spread abroad of the discovery of mountains of gold and precious stones in the territories of the company. The shares of the association rose by leaps and bounds to fabulous prices. The end was soon reached. The inflated scheme, which was to make everybody "rich and happy," collapsed, spreading broadcast bankruptcy and financial ruin, and passed into history as "The Mississippi Bubble."

In 1723 the prince's minority ended and he assumed the government. The atmosphere in which he had been brought up had wholly corrupted a nature seemingly prone to evil. He was completely under the influence of his mistresses, of whom the most notorious was Madame de Pompadour. The loves, the hates, and the caprices of this woman were for nineteen years a chief factor in the decision of the weightiest matters of war and of peace. The highest appointments in the army and the navy were dictated by her. For a long series of years she was practically the prime minister of France.

The conditions surrounding the throne being of this nature, it is not surprising that under Louis XV the influence, power, and prestige of France sensibly declined. She took part, indeed, but usually with injury to her military reputation, in all the wars of this period. The most important of these for France was the

Seven Years' War (1756–1763), known in America as the French and Indian War, which resulted in the loss to France of Canada in the New World and of her Indian empire in the Old.

Though thus shorn of her colonial possessions, France managed to hold in Europe the provinces won for her by the wars and diplomacy of Louis XIV, and even made some fresh acquisitions of territory along the Rhenish frontier, besides gaining the island of Corsica in the Mediterranean, the birthplace of one who was soon to have much to do in shaping the destinies of France.

But, taken all together, the period was one of great national humiliation: the French fleet was almost driven from the sea; the martial spirit of the nation visibly declined; and France, from being the foremost of the states of Europe, became the least among the great powers.

Selections from the Sources. — *Memoirs of the Duke of Saint-Simon* (trans. by Bayle St. John). Nowhere else can be found so lively and entertaining an account of life at court under Louis XIV and the Regency as here. For glimpses of other sides of the life of the times read the *Letters of Madame de Sévigné*, accessible in different editions. These delightful letters cover the last half of the seventeenth century.

Secondary Works. — For a comprehensive view of this period there is nothing superior to *The Age of Louis XIV* and *The Decline of the French Monarchy*, — translations by Mary L. Booth of the corresponding parts of Henri Martin's *Histoire de France*. WAKEMAN, *Europe, 1598–1715*, chaps. vi, vii, and ix–xv. KITCHIN, *A History of France*, vol. iii. HASSALL, *The French People*, chaps. xii–xiv; and *Louis XIV and the Zenith of the French Monarchy*. PERKINS, *France under Mazarin*, vol. ii; *France under the Regency;* and *France under Louis XV*. These are all scholarly works of marked merit. WILLIAMS, *Madame de Pompadour*. For the history of the French in America during the age of Louis XIV, the reader will have recourse to FISKE, *New England and New France*, chap. iv; and to PARKMAN, *Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV*.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The Parliament of Paris. 2. Colbert. 3. The harrowing of the Palatinate by Louis. 4. New France under Louis XIV. 5. The Palace at Versailles. 6. Life at the court. 7. Molière. 8. The Mississippi Bubble.

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE STUARTS AND THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION (1603–1689)

I. The First Two Stuarts

Reign of James the First (1603–1625)

458. James' Conception of Kingship. — With the end of the Tudor line (sec. 393), James VI of Scotland, son of Mary Stuart, came to the English throne as James I of England. The accession of the House of Stuart brought England and Scotland under the same sovereignty, though each country still retained its own legislature.

James, like the other Stuarts who followed him on the English throne, was a firm believer in the doctrine of the divine right of kings. He held that hereditary princes are the Lord's anointed, and that their authority can in no way be questioned or limited by people, priest, or Parliament. These are his own words: "It is atheism and blasphemy to dispute what God can do: good Christians content themselves with His will revealed in His word; so it is presumption and high contempt in a subject to dispute what a king can do, or say that a king cannot do this or that." [1]

A strong support for this Stuart conception of the unlimited authority of kings was found in French theory and practice. The Stuarts were related to the French family of the Guises. They were in sympathy with French modes of thought. Further, Charles I had for wife a French princess, Henrietta Maria. These affiliations with France naturally brought the Stuarts under French influence. They imitated the Bourbons. They quoted them constantly, and

[1] From the king's speech in the Star Chamber, 1616.

strove to make the government of England like that of France, an absolute monarchy.[2]

But the Commons of the English Parliament, and probably the majority of the English people, differed with their Stuart kings in their views concerning the nature of government, and particularly concerning the nature of the English government. In this difference of views lay hidden, as we shall learn, the germs of the Civil War and of all that grew out of it, — the Commonwealth, the Protectorate, and the Revolution of 1689.

459. **The Gunpowder Plot** (1605). — In the second year of James' reign was unearthed an extraordinary plot to blow up with gunpowder the Parliament building, upon the opening day of the session of the Houses, when king, Lords, and Commons would all be present, and thus to destroy at a single blow every branch of the government.

This conspiracy, known as the Gunpowder Plot, was entered into by some Catholics because they were disappointed in the course which the king and the Parliament had taken as regards their religion.[3] The leader of the conspiracy, Guy Fawkes, was arrested, and after being put to the rack was executed. His chief accomplices were also seized and punished. The alarm created by the terrible plot led Parliament to enact some very severe laws against the Catholics.

460. **Contest between James and the Commons; "the Sovereign King and the Sovereign People."** — It has been seen what ideas James entertained of the kingly office. Such a view of royal authority and privileges was sure to bring him into conflict with Parliament, especially with the House of Commons. He was constantly dissolving Parliament and sending the members home, because they insisted upon considering subjects which he had told them they should let alone.

An incident vividly lights up the situation. A committee from the Commons was about to wait upon the king. "Place twelve

[2] For the popular superstition of the "Royal Touch" and its bearing upon the matter discussed in this section, see Lecky, *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i, chap. i.

[3] Though son of the Catholic Mary Stuart, James had been educated as a Protestant.

armchairs," said James to his attendants; "I am going to receive twelve kings." What the king said in bitter irony was the simple truth. James, when he met the committee from the Commons, met men who were as sure that they had a divine right to rule England as he was that he had a divine commission to that same end. As the historian Guizot tersely expresses it, "Both king and people thought as sovereigns." Here were the conditions of an irrepressible conflict.

The chief matters of dispute between the king and the Commons were the limits of the authority of the former in matters touching legislation and taxation, and the nature and extent of the privileges and jurisdiction of the latter.

As to the limits of the royal power, James talked and acted as though his prerogatives were practically unbounded. He issued proclamations which in their scope were really laws, and then enforced these royal edicts by fines and imprisonment as though they were regular statutes of Parliament. Moreover, taking advantage of some uncertainty in the law as regards the power of the king to collect customs at the ports of the realm, he laid new and unusual duties upon imports and exports. James' judges were servile enough to sustain him in this course, some of them going so far as to say in effect that "the seaports are the king's gates, which he may open and shut to whom he pleases."

As to the privileges of the Commons, that body insisted, among other things, upon their right to determine all cases of contested election of their members, and to debate freely all questions concerning the common weal, without being liable to prosecution or imprisonment for words spoken in the House. James denied that these privileges were matters of right pertaining to the Commons, and repeatedly intimated to them that it was only through his own gracious permission and the favor of his ancestors that they were allowed to exercise these liberties at all, and that if their conduct was not more circumspect and reverential he should take away their privileges entirely.

On one occasion, the Commons having ventured in debate upon certain matters of state which the king had forbidden them to

meddle with, he, in reproving them, made a more express denial than ever of their rights and privileges, which caused them, in a burst of noble indignation, to spread upon their journal a brave protest, known as "The Great Protestation," which declared that "the liberties, franchises, privileges, and jurisdictions of Parliament are the ancient and undoubted birthright and inheritance of the subjects of England, and that the arduous and urgent affairs concerning the king, state, and defense of the realm and the Church of England . . . are proper subjects and matter of council and debate in Parliament" (1621).

When intelligence of this action was carried to the king, he angrily adjourned Parliament, sent for the journal of the House, and with his own hands struck out the obnoxious resolution. Then he dissolved Parliament, and even went so far as to imprison several of the members of the Commons. In these high-handed measures we get a glimpse of the Stuart theory of government, and see the way paved for the final break between king and people in the following reign.

461. Colonies and Trade Settlements. — The reign of James I is signalized by the commencement of that system of colonization which has resulted in the establishment of the English race in almost every quarter of the globe. In the year 1607 Jamestown, so named in honor of the king, was founded in Virginia. This was the first permanent English settlement within the limits of the United States. In 1620 some Separatists, or Pilgrims, who had found in Holland a temporary refuge from persecution, pushed across the Atlantic, and amidst heroic sufferings and unparalleled hardships established the first settlement in New England and laid the foundations of civil liberty in the New World.

Besides planting these settlements in the New World, the English during this same reign established themselves in the ancient land of India. In 1613 the East India Company established their first factory at Surat. This was the humble beginning of the gigantic English Empire in the East.

In this connection must also be noticed the Plantation of Ulster in Ireland. The northern part of that island having been desolated

by the Tyrone Rebellion (sec. 391), and large tracts of land having been forfeited to the English crown, this land was now given by royal grant to English and Scotch settlers. Some of the Celtic clans were removed bodily, and assigned lands in other parts of the island. This movement began in 1610. Its aim was to Protestantize and Anglicize the country. The end sought was in a good measure attained. In less than a century after the beginning of the colonization movement there were over a million Protestants of the Presbyterian sect settled in Ulster. The injustice and harshness of the treatment of the Irish natives awakened among them a spirit of bitter hostility to the newcomers, which, intensified by fresh wrongs, has imbittered all the relations of Ireland and England up to our own day.

462. **Literature.** — One of the most noteworthy literary labors of the reign under review was a new translation of the Bible, known as *King James' Version*, published in 1611. This version is the one in general use in the Protestant Church at the present day.

The most noted writers of James' reign were a bequest to it from the brilliant era of Elizabeth.[4] Sir Walter Raleigh, the petted courtier of Elizabeth, fell on evil days after her death. On the charge of taking part in a conspiracy against the crown, he was sent to the Tower, where he was kept a prisoner for thirteen years. From the tedium of his long confinement he found relief in the composition of a *History of the World*. He was at last beheaded (1618).

The close of the life of the great philosopher Francis Bacon was scarcely less sad than that of Sir Walter Raleigh. He held the office of Lord Chancellor, and, yielding to the temptations of the corrupt times upon which he had fallen, accepted fees from the suitors who brought cases before him. He was impeached and brought to the bar of the House of Lords, where he confessed his fault, but asserted that the money he took never influenced his judgment. He appealed pathetically to his judges "to be merciful

[4] Shakespeare died about the middle of the reign (in 1616). Several of his companion dramatists, who like himself began their career under Elizabeth, also outlived the queen, and did most of their work during the reign of her successor.

to a broken reed." He was sentenced to pay a heavy fine and to imprisonment in the Tower. But the king in pity released him from all the penalty and even conferred a pension upon him. He lived only five years after his fall and disgrace, dying in 1626.

Bacon must be given the first place among the philosophers of the English-speaking race. His system is known as the "Inductive Method of Philosophy." It insists upon experiment and a careful observation of facts as the only true means of arriving at a knowledge of the laws of nature.

Reign of Charles the First (1625–1649)

463. The Petition of Right (1628). — Charles I came to the throne with all his father's lofty notions about the divine right of kings. He made his own these words of Scripture: "Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou?"[5] Consequently the old contest between king and Parliament was straightway renewed. The first two Parliaments of his reign Charles dissolved speedily, because instead of voting supplies they persisted in investigating public grievances.

After the dissolution of his second Parliament, Charles endeavored to raise by means of benevolences (sec. 361) and forced loans the money he needed to carry on the government. But all his expedients failed to meet his needs, and he was forced to fall back upon Parliament. The Houses met, and promised to grant him generous subsidies, provided he would approve a certain *Petition of Right* which they had drawn up. Next after Magna Carta, this document is the most important in the constitutional history of England. Four abuses were provided against: (1) the raising of money by loans, benevolences, taxes, etc., without the consent of Parliament; (2) imprisonment without cause shown; (3) the quartering of soldiers in private houses, — a very vexatious thing; and (4) trial by martial law, that is, without jury.

Charles was as reluctant to assent to the petition as King John was to assent to Magna Carta; but he was at length forced to

[5] Ecclesiastes viii 4; cited by Charles on his trial in 1649.

give sanction to it by the use of the usual formula, "Let it be law as desired" (1628).

464. **Charles rules without Parliament** (1629–1640). — It soon became evident that Charles was utterly insincere when he gave his assent to the Petition of Right. He immediately violated its provisions in attempting to raise money by forbidden taxes and loans. For eleven years he ruled without Parliament, thus changing the government of England from a government by king, Lords, and Commons to what was in effect an absolute and irresponsible monarchy, like that of France or of Spain.

FIG. 78. — CHARLES I. (After a painting by *Vandyke*)

Prominent among Charles' most active agents were his ministers, Thomas Wentworth, later Earl of Strafford, and William Laud, Bishop of London and later Archbishop of Canterbury, both of whom earned unenviable reputations through their industry and success in building up the absolute power of their master upon the ruins of the ancient institutions of English liberty.

The high-handed and tyrannical proceedings of Charles and his agents were enforced by three iniquitous courts of usurped and arbitrary jurisdiction. These were known as the "Council of the North," the "Star Chamber," and the "High Commission Court." [6] All of these courts sat without jury, and

[6] The first was a tribunal established by Henry VIII, and now employed by Wentworth as an instrument for enforcing the king's despotic authority in the turbulent northern counties of England. The Star Chamber was a court organized by Henry VII, which at this time dealt chiefly with criminal cases affecting the government,

being composed of the creatures of the king, were of course his subservient instruments. Often their decisions were unjust and arbitrary, their punishments harsh and cruel.

465. **John Hampden and Ship Money** (1637–1638). — Among the illegal taxes levied during this period of tyranny was a species known as "ship money," so called from the fact that in early times the kings, when the realm was in danger, called upon the seaports and maritime counties to contribute ships and ship material for the public service. Charles and his agents, in looking this matter over, conceived the idea of extending this tax over the inland as well as the seaboard counties.

Among those who refused to pay the tax was a country gentleman named John Hampden. The case was tried in the Court of Exchequer, before all the twelve judges. All England watched the progress of the suit with the utmost solicitude. The question was argued by able counsel both on the side of Hampden and of the crown. Judgment was finally rendered in favor of the king, although five of the twelve judges stood for Hampden. The case was lost; but the people, who had been following the arguments, were fully persuaded that it went against Hampden simply for the reason that the judges stood in fear of the royal displeasure should they dare to decide the case adversely to the crown.

The arbitrary and despotic character which the government had now assumed in both civil and religious matters, and the hopelessness of relief or protection from the courts, caused thousands to seek in the New World that freedom and security which was denied them in their own land.

466. **The Bishops' War** (1639). — England was ready to rise in open revolt against the unbearable tyranny. Events in Scotland hastened the crisis. The king was attempting to impose the English liturgy (slightly modified) upon the Scotch Presbyterians. A Sabbath was set on which the liturgy should be introduced in all the churches. To the Scotch this seemed little short of a

such as riot, libel, and conspiracy. The High Commission Court was a tribunal of forty-four commissioners, created in Elizabeth's reign to enforce the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity.

restoration of the "Popery" they had renounced. Tradition tells how at Edinburgh the attempt of the bishop to read the service led to a riot, one of the worshipers, Janet Geddes by name, flinging her stool at the bishop's head.[7] The spirit of resistance spread. All classes, nobles and peasants alike, bound themselves by a solemn covenant to resist to the very last every attempt to make innovations in their religion.

The king resolved to crush the movement by force. The Scotch accepted the challenge with all that ardor which religious enthusiasm never fails to inspire. Charles soon found that war could not be carried on without money, and was constrained to summon Parliament in hopes of obtaining a vote of supplies. But instead of making the king a grant of money, the Commons first gave their attention to the matter of grievances, whereupon Charles dissolved the Parliament. The Scottish forces crossed the border, and the king, helpless, with an empty treasury and a seditious army, was forced again to summon the two Houses.

407. The Long Parliament. — Under this call met on Nov. 3, 1640, the Parliament which, from the circumstance of its sitting for twelve years, and legally existing for nearly twenty, became known as the "Long Parliament." A small majority of the members of the Commons of this Parliament were stern and determined men, men who fully realized the danger in which the traditional liberties of Englishmen were set, and who were resolved to put a check to the despotic course of the king.

Almost the first act of the Commons was the impeachment of Strafford, as the most prominent instrument of the king's tyranny and usurpation. He was finally condemned by a bill of attainder[8] and sent to the block.

To secure themselves against dissolution before their work was done, the Houses passed a bill which provided that they should not be adjourned or dissolved without their own consent. The

[7] The "flight of Jenny's stool" holds some such place in the story of the English Revolution as the throwing of the tea into Boston harbor holds in the story of the American Revolution.

[8] See sec. 375, n. 5. Laud was executed in 1645.

three arbitrary courts of which we have spoken, the High Commission Court, the Council of the North, and the Star Chamber, were abolished. Finally, an act was passed declaring the illegality of ship money and annulling the judgment against John Hampden "as contrary to and against the laws and statutes of this realm."



FIG. 79. — EXECUTION OF THE EARL OF STRAFFORD. (From a contemporary print)

468. The Insurrection in Ireland (1641). — The situation was critical; it was rendered still more so by an uprising in Ireland.[9] Taking advantage of the quarrel between Charles and his Parliament, the Irish Catholics rose in revolt. The aim of the insurrection was to wipe out the colony planted in the reign of James I (sec. 461), and to bring to an end Protestant ascendancy in Ireland. Von Ranke characterizes the insurrection as one of the

[9] It was just after the outbreak of the revolt that the Commons drew up and published what is known as "The Grand Remonstrance." For the text of this important document and the accompanying petition, see Gardiner's *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, vol. ii, pp. 203–232.

most cruel of which we have record. It was cruel because the native Irish were stirred not only by deep race enmity but also by bitter religious hatred. Neither age nor sex was spared. Thousands of the English and Scotch settlers perished miserably. It was not long before an English Protestant army made savage reprisals (sec. 478).

469. **Charles' Attempt to seize the Five Members.** — An imprudent act on the part of Charles now precipitated the nation into the gulf of civil war, towards which events had been so rapidly drifting. With the design of overawing the Commons, the king made a charge of treason against five of the leading members, among whom were Hampden and Pym, and sent officers to effect their arrest; but the accused were not to be found. The next day Charles himself, accompanied by armed attendants, went to the House for the purpose of seizing the five members; but, having been forewarned of the king's intention, they had withdrawn from the hall. The king was not long in realizing the state of affairs, and with the observation, "I see the birds have flown," withdrew from the chamber.

Charles had taken a fatal step. The nation could not forgive the insult offered to its representatives. All London rose in arms. The king, frightened by the storm which his rashness had raised, fled from the city to York. From the flight of Charles from London may be dated the beginning of the civil war (Jan. 10, 1642).

The Civil War (1642–1649)

470. **The Two Parties.** — The country was now divided into two great parties. Those that enlisted under the king's standard — on whose side rallied, for the most part, the nobility, the gentry, and the clergy — were known as Royalists or Cavaliers; while those that gathered about the Parliamentary banner, the townsmen and the yeomanry, were called Parliamentarians or Roundheads, the latter term being applied to them because many of their number cropped their hair close to the head, simply for the reason that the Cavaliers affected long and flowing locks.

The most noted leader of the Royalists was the king's nephew, Prince Rupert, a dashing cavalry officer; the commander of the Parliamentary forces was the Earl of Essex. The Cavaliers favored the Established Episcopal Church, while the Roundheads were Puritans. During the progress of the struggle the Presbyterians and Independents (later Congregationalists) became the leading factions in the Puritan party.

471. **Oliver Cromwell and his "Ironsides."** — The war had continued about three years[10] when there came into prominence among the officers of the Parliamentary forces a man of destiny, one of the great characters of history, — Oliver Cromwell. During the early campaigns of the war, as colonel of a troop of cavalry, he had exhibited his rare genius as an organizer and disciplinarian. His regiment became famous under the name of "Cromwell's Ironsides." It was composed entirely of "men of religion." Swearing, drinking, and the usual vices of the camp were unknown among them. They advanced to the charge with the singing of psalms. During all the war the regiment was never once beaten.

472. **The "Self-Denying Ordinance" and the "New Model" (1645).** — The military operations of these earlier years of the war had revealed fatal defects in the Parliamentary army. It was composed of local bands, was irregularly paid, and was in large part officered by persons who had received their commissions because of their social rank. The soldiers were mutinous, and in the opinion of one of their officers, who wrote the Commons about their conduct, were "fit only for a gallows here and a hell hereafter." Such an army could never beat the Royalists.

The leaders in the Commons got rid of the titled inefficients by means of a measure known as the "Self-Denying Ordinance," which required that members of either House holding commands in the army should resign within forty days. At the same time they created a new army of twenty-one thousand men, called the

[10] The first skirmish of the war was at Edgehill (1642), but the most important engagement of these earlier years was the battle of Marston Moor (1644), in which the Royalists suffered a severe defeat.

"New Model." It differed from the earlier Parliamentary force as a regular army differs from militia. Sir Thomas Fairfax was created commander-in-chief, and Cromwell was made lieutenant-general, which gave him command of the horse.[11]

Religious opinions had not been made a test for admission to the new army; but as a matter of fact its officers were for the most part Independents, and in the course of time the army through their influence became such a body of religious enthusiasts as the world had not seen since Godfrey led his crusaders to the rescue of the Holy Sepulcher. A great part of the men were fervent, God-fearing, psalm-singing Puritans. When not fighting, they studied the Bible, prayed, and sang hymns.

473. **The Battle of Naseby** (1645). — The temper of the "New Model" was soon tried in the battle of Naseby, the decisive engagement of the war. The Royalists were beaten and their cause was irretrievably lost. Charles escaped from the field, and ultimately fled into Scotland, thinking that he might rely upon the loyalty of the Scots to the House of Stuart; but on his refusing to sign the Covenant and certain other articles, they gave him up to the English Parliament.

474. **"Pride's Purge"** (1648). — Now, there were many in the Parliament who were in favor of restoring the king to his throne on the basis of conditions which he himself had proposed, that is to say, without requiring from him any sufficient guaranties that he would in the future rule in accordance with the constitution and the laws of the land. The Independents, that is to say Cromwell and the army, saw in this possibility the threatened ruin of all their hopes and the loss of all the fruits of victory. A high-handed measure was resolved upon, — the exclusion from the House of Commons of all those members who favored the restoration of Charles.

Accordingly an officer by the name of Pride was stationed at the door of the hall to exclude or to arrest the members obnoxious

[11] There were two self-denying ordinances; the second, unlike the first, did not permanently disqualify for office. Cromwell, like the others concerned, gave up his post, but was almost immediately reappointed.

to the army. One hundred and forty-three members were thus kept from their seats, and the Commons became reduced to about fifty representatives. This performance was appropriately called "Pride's Purge." "The minority had now become the majority." But that is not an approved way of creating a majority.

475. **Trial and Execution of the King** (Jan. 30, 1649). — The Commons thus "purged" of the king's friends now passed a resolution for the immediate trial of Charles for treason. A High

FIG. 80. — WESTMINSTER HALL. (From a photograph)

This ancient hall was the scene of the trial and condemnation of Charles I. It had previously witnessed the condemnation to death of many celebrated persons, among whom were William Wallace, Sir Thomas More, and the Earl of Strafford.

Court of Justice, comprising one hundred and thirty-five members, was organized, before which Charles was summoned. Appearing before the court, he denied its authority to try him, consistently maintaining that no earthly tribunal could rightly question his acts. But the trial went on, and before the close of a week he was condemned to be executed "as a tyrant, traitor, murderer, and public enemy to the good people of this nation."

In a few days the sentence was carried out. Charles bore himself in the presence of death with great composure and dignity.

On the scaffold he spoke these words, the sincerity of which cannot be doubted: "For the people truly I desire their liberty and freedom as much as anybody whatsoever; but I must tell you that their liberty and freedom consists in having government; . . . it is not in their having a share in the government; that is nothing pertaining to them."

II. The Commonwealth and the Protectorate (1649–1660)

476. **Establishment of the Commonwealth.** — A few weeks after the execution of Charles, the Commons voted to abolish the office of king as "unnecessary, burdensome, and dangerous to the liberty, safety, and public interest of the people," and also to do away with the House of Lords as likewise "useless and dangerous to the people of England," and to establish a free state under the name of "The Commonwealth." A new Great Seal was made with this legend and date: "In the first year of freedom, by God's blessing restored, 1648."[12] The executive power was lodged in a Council of State, composed of forty-one persons. Of this body the eminent patriot Sir Henry Vane was the leading member.

477. **Troubles of the Commonwealth.** — The republic thus born of mingled religious and political enthusiasm was beset with dangers from the very first. The execution of Charles had alarmed every sovereign in Europe. Russia, France, and the Dutch Republic[13] all refused to have any communication with the ambassadors of the Commonwealth. The Scots, who too late repented of having surrendered their sovereign into the hands of his enemies, now hastened to wipe out the stain of their disloyalty by proclaiming his son their king, with the title of Charles the Second. The Royalists in Ireland declared for the prince; while the Dutch began active preparations to assist him in regaining the throne

[12] According to the method of reckoning then in vogue, the year 1648 did not end until March 24.

[13] William II, the Stadtholder of all the Dutch provinces except Friesland, was the son-in-law of Charles I.

of his unfortunate father. In England itself the Royalists were active and threatening.

478. War with Ireland (1649–1652). — The Commonwealth, like the ancient republic of Rome, seemed to gather strength and energy from the very multitude of surrounding dangers. Cromwell was made Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and sent into that country to crush the Royalist party there. With his "Ironsides" he made quick and terrible work of the suppression of the Catholic Royalists. Having taken by storm the town of Drogheda, which had refused his summons to surrender, he massacred the entire garrison, consisting of three thousand men (1649). About a thousand who had sought asylum in a church were butchered there without mercy. The capture of other towns was accompanied by massacres little less terrible. The following is his own account of the manner in which he dealt with the captured garrisons: "When they submitted, their officers were knocked on the head, and every tenth man of the soldiers killed, and the rest shipped for Barbadoes." Cromwell's savage cruelty in his dealings with the Irish is an indelible stain on his memory.

The Catholic Royalists having been defeated, the best lands of the island were confiscated and granted to English and Scotch settlers, after the manner of the colonization of Protestant immigrants in Ulster in the reign of James I (sec. 461). This method of securing Protestant ascendancy in the island is what English history designates as the "Cromwellian settlement," but which Irish resentment calls the "Curse of Cromwell." The religious ferocity of this Puritan settlement of Ireland fanned fiercely the flame of hatred which earlier wrongs had kindled in the hearts of the Irish people against their English conquerors, — a flame which has not yet burned itself out.[14]

479. War with Scotland (1650–1651). — Cromwell was called out of Ireland by the Council to lead an army into Scotland.

[14] Between the years 1641 and 1652 over half a million inhabitants of the island were destroyed or banished; Prendergast (*Cromwellian Settlement*, p. 177) affirms that during these years and those immediately following five sixths of the population perished. "A man might travel," he says, "for twenty or thirty miles and not see a living creature."

The terror of his name went before him, and the people fled as he approached. At Dunbar he met the Scottish army. Before the terrible onset of the fanatic Roundheads the Scots were scattered like chaff before the wind. Ten thousand were made prisoners, and all the camp train and artillery were captured (1650).

The following year, on the anniversary of the battle of Dunbar, Cromwell gained another great victory over the Scottish army at Worcester, and all Scotland was soon after forced to submit to the authority of the Commonwealth. Prince Charles, after many adventurous experiences, escaped across the Channel into Normandy.

480. **War with the Dutch** (1652–1654). — With the authority of the Commonwealth acknowledged throughout the British Isles, the Parliament sought to increase the power and influence of the republic and to benefit English commerce by an alliance with the Dutch; but since such a confederation as that proposed would have made the Netherlands little more than a province of the English Commonwealth, the Dutch refused, rather contemptuously, to enter into the arrangement. The English Parliament thereupon passed a measure known as the Navigation Act (1651), which forbade foreign ships to bring into England any products or manufactures save those of their own country. This was a blow aimed at the Dutch, whose ships brought to the English docks the products of every land on the globe, including the English colonies in America.

In the war which ensued the English found a worthy foe in the stout Dutch sailors. That they were able to wage war with them on anything like equal terms was due largely to the foresight and energy of Sir Henry Vane, who was the real head of the English government from 1649 to 1653, and who in the carrying out of his policy to build up the navy as a counterpoise to the army, which was overshadowing the civil authority and threatening the establishment of a military dictatorship, had greatly developed and strengthened the sea power of England. After the rival fleets had inflicted great injury and loss upon each other in many a stubborn sea fight, the two republics were reconciled (1654).

481. Cromwell ejects the Long Parliament (1653). — While the Dutch war was going on, the Parliament that provoked it had come to an open quarrel with the army. Cromwell demanded of Parliament their dissolution and the calling of a new body. This they refused; whereupon, taking with him a body of soldiers, Cromwell went to the House, and after listening impatiently for a while to the debate, suddenly sprang to his feet and with bitter reproaches exclaimed: "I will put an end to your prating. Get you gone; give place to better men. You are no Parliament. The Lord has done with you." At a prearranged signal his soldiers rushed in. The hall was cleared. Picking up the speaker's mace, Cromwell contemptuously asked, "What shall be done with his bauble?" "Take it away," he ordered. Then the soldiers withdrew from the hall and the door was locked.

In such summary manner the Long Parliament, or the "Rump Parliament," as it was called in derision after "Pride's Purge," was dissolved, after having sat for twelve years. So completely had the body lost the confidence and respect of all parties that scarcely a murmur was heard against the illegal and arbitrary mode of its dissolution.

482. The "Little Parliament" and the Establishment of the Protectorate (1653). — Cromwell now called together a new Parliament or more properly a convention, summoning, so far as he might, only religious, God-fearing men. The "Little Parliament," as sometimes called, consisted of one hundred and fifty-six members, mainly religious zealots, who spent much of their time in Scripture exegesis, prayer, and exhortation. Among them was a London leather merchant, named Praise-God Barebone, who was especially given to these exercises. The name amused the people, and as the exhorter was a fair representative of a considerable section of the convention, they nicknamed it "Barebone's Parliament," by which designation it has passed into history.

The "Little Parliament" sat only five months, and then, resigning all its authority into the hands of Cromwell, dissolved itself. A sort of constitution, called the "Instrument of Government,"

was now drawn up by a council of army officers and approved by Cromwell. This instrument, the first of written constitutions, provided for a Parliament consisting of a single House, a Council of State, and an executive or president serving for life and bearing the title of "Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland." Under this instrument Cromwell became Lord Protector for life.

FIG. 81. — OLIVER CROMWELL. (Taken at the age of fifty-eight years. From an enlargement in oil of the head drawn in water colors by *Samuel Cooper*, now the property of the Duke of Buccleuch)

483. The Protectorate (1653–1659). — Cromwell's power was now almost unlimited. He was virtually a dictator, for he had the power of the army behind him. The Protector summoned, winnowed, and dissolved Parliament at pleasure. He could get together no body of men who could or would work smoothly with him. "The Lord judge between me and you," were his words of dismissal to his last unmanageable and obstinate Parliament.

For five years Cromwell carried on the government practically alone. His rule was arbitrary but enlightened. He gave England the strongest government she had had since the days of Wolsey and of Elizabeth, a government which, while securing obedience and prosperity at home, won the fear and respect of foreign

powers, so that Cromwell addressing Parliament could truthfully declare, "I dare say that there is not a nation in Europe but is willing to ask a good understanding with you."

Cromwell's aim was "to make England great and to make her worthy of greatness." This worthiness he, zealous Puritan as he was, conceived could be acquired by England only as her affairs were conducted by godly men and in accord with the plain precepts of Scripture.

Further, in Oliver's mind, the English nation could be God's own people and worthy of greatness only as England upheld the Protestant cause in Europe. It was this religious persuasion which led him to become the protector of Protestantism wherever imperiled. He interposed successfully in behalf of the Huguenots in France, and secured for them a respite from harassment; he obliged the Duke of Savoy to cease his cruel persecution of the Vaudois; and caused the Pope to be informed that if the Protestants continued to be molested anywhere — Cromwell laid the blame of everything done against Protestant interests at the door of the Papacy — the roar of English guns would speedily awaken the echoes of St. Angelo.

It was with the double aim of making England great on the sea and of crippling the champion of Catholicism that Cromwell entered into an alliance with France against Spain. During a great part of his rule the Protector was fighting this old-time foe of England and of Protestantism. He captured her treasure ships within sight of the ports of the peninsula, wrested from her the island of Jamaica in the West Indies, and secured the cession of the important seaport of Dunkirk on the Straits of Dover.

484. **Cromwell's Death.** — Notwithstanding Cromwell was a man of immovable resolution and iron spirit, still he felt sorely the burdens of his government, and was deeply troubled by the anxieties of his position. In the midst of apparent success he was painfully conscious of utter failure. He had wished to establish a permanent government by "a single person" and Parliament, with himself as the recognized constitutional head of the state. Instead, he found himself a military usurper, whose title was simply

the title of the sword. His government, we may believe, was as hateful to himself as to the great mass of the English people. He lived in constant fear of the dagger. With his constitution undermined by overwork and anxiety, fever attacked him, and with gloomy apprehensions as to the terrible dangers into which England might drift after his hand had fallen from the helm of affairs, he lay down to die, passing away on the day which he had always called his "fortunate day" — the anniversary of his great victories of Dunbar and Worcester (Sept. 3, 1658).

As when the great Napoleon lay dying at St. Helena the island was shaken by a fierce tempest, so now the elements seemed to be in sympathy with the restless soul of Cromwell. "A storm which tore roofs from houses and leveled huge trees in every forest seemed a fitting prelude to the passing away of his mighty spirit." But the enemies of the Protector believed that the tempest was raised by the devil, who had come for Oliver's soul.

485. **Richard Cromwell** (1658–1659). — Cromwell with his dying breath — so it was given out — had designated his son Richard as his successor in the office of the Protectorate. Richard was exactly the opposite of his father, — timid, irresolute, and irreligious. The control of affairs that had taxed to the utmost the genius and resources of the father was altogether too great an undertaking for the incapacity and inexperience of the son. No one was quicker to realize this than Richard himself, and after a rule of a few months, yielding to the pressure of the army, whose displeasure he had incurred, he resigned his office.

486. **The Restoration** (1660). — For some months after the fall of the Protectorate the country trembled on the verge of anarchy. The gloomy outlook into the future and the unsatisfactory experiment of the Commonwealth caused the great mass of the English people earnestly to desire the restoration of the monarchy, — in truth, the majority of the nation had never desired its abolition. Charles Stuart, towards whom the tide of returning loyalty was running, was now in Holland. General Monk, the commander of the army in Scotland and the representative of Scottish sentiment, marched south to London and assumed virtual control of affairs.

The Long Parliament, including the members ejected by Pride (sec. 481), now reassembled, and by resolution declared that "according to the ancient and fundamental laws of this kingdom the government is and ought to be by king, Lords, and Commons." An invitation was sent to Prince Charles to return to his people and take his place upon the throne of his ancestors.

Amid the wildest demonstrations of joy Charles stepped ashore on the island from which he had been for nine years an exile. As he observed the extensive preparations made for his reception, and received from all parties the warmest congratulations, he remarked with pleasant satire, "Surely it is my own fault that I have remained these years in exile from a country which is so glad to see me."

487. **Why the Puritan Revolution failed.** — The Puritan Revolution had failed. To assign the deeper causes of this failure, whether in circumstances or in the personal character of Cromwell or of other leaders of the movement, would be a difficult thing to do; but without much hesitation we may say that one of the near-lying causes of the failure was that the Puritans committed the fault — which has been declared to be almost always the fault of revolutionists — of going too fast and too far. At the outset the Revolution had for its aim simply the setting of reasonable restrictions upon the exercise of the royal authority. Very soon, however, the kingly office, the hereditary House of Lords, and the Episcopal Church had been abolished. Each of these extreme measures raised up many implacable enemies of the Revolution.

Then again, Puritanism, in many things, had got far away from English good sense. The Puritan regulations respecting harmless amusements, the observance of the Sabbath, and a hundred other matters were extreme and absurd, and well calculated to provoke the scoff of the godless. So while in some directions the Puritans were merely in advance of the mass of the English people, in others they had gone far aside from the path that England was treading or was ever going to tread. Hence Puritanism was bound to fail.

But to leave the matter thus would be misleading. In a deeper sense Puritanism did not fail. "What of heroism, what of

eternal light," says Carlyle, "there be in a man and his life . . . remains forever a new divine portion of the sum of things." And so was it with Puritanism. What of heroism and of truth there was in it — and there was much of both — was added to the sum of English history. Much that is best and truest in the life of England to-day and of Greater England beyond the seas strikes its roots deep in the Puritanism of the seventeenth century.

488. **Puritan Literature; it lights up the Religious Side of the English Revolution.** — No epoch in history receives a fresher illustration from the study of its literature than that of the Puritan Revolution. To neglect this, and yet hope to gain a true conception of that wonderful episode in the life of the English people by an examination of its outer events and incidents alone, would, as Green declares, be like trying to form an idea of the life and work of ancient Israel from *Kings* and *Chronicles*, without *Psalms* and *Prophets*. The true character of the English Revolution, especially upon its religious side, must be sought in the magnificent epic of Milton and the unequaled allegory of Bunyan.

Both of these great works, it is true, were written after the Restoration, but they were both inspired by that spirit which had struck down despotism and set up the Commonwealth. The epic was the work of a lonely, disappointed republican; the allegory, of a captive Puritan.

Milton (1608–1674) stands as the grandest representative of Puritanism. After the death of Charles I he wrote a famous work in Latin entitled *The Defense of the English People*, in which he justified the execution of the king. His *Areopagitica* or *Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing*, written some years earlier, is an eloquent plea for freedom of opinion and of teaching.

The Restoration forced Milton into retirement, and the last fourteen years of his life were passed apart from the world. It was during these years that, in loneliness and blindness, he composed the immortal poems *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*. The former is the "Epic of Puritanism." All that was truest and grandest in the Puritan character found expression in the moral elevation and religious fervor of this the greatest of Christian epics.

John Bunyan (1628–1688) was a Puritan nonconformist. After the Restoration he was imprisoned for twelve years in Bedford jail, on account of nonconformity to the established worship. It was during this dreary confinement that he wrote his *Pilgrim's Progress*, the most admirable allegory in English literature. The habit of the Puritan, from constant study of the Bible, to employ in all forms of discourse its language and imagery, is best illustrated in the pages of this remarkable work. Here, as nowhere else, we learn what realities to the Puritan were the Bible representations of sin, repentance, and atonement, of heaven and hell.

III. The Restored Stuarts

Reign of Charles the Second (1660–1685)

489. **Punishment of the Regicides.** — The monarchy having been restored in the person of Charles II, Parliament extended a general pardon to all who had taken part in the late rebellion, except Sir Henry Vane and certain of the judges who had condemned Charles to the block. Thirteen of these were executed with revolting cruelty, their hearts and bowels being cut out of their living bodies. Others of the regicides were condemned to imprisonment for life. Vane was finally executed. Death had already removed the other great leaders of the rebellion, — Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw, — beyond the reach of Royalist hate; so vengeance was taken upon their bodies. These were dragged from their tombs in Westminster Abbey, hauled to Tyburn, and there on the anniversary of Charles' execution were hanged, and afterwards beheaded (1661).

490. **The Conventicle and Five-Mile Acts.** — Early in the reign the services of the Anglican Church were restored by Parliament, and harsh laws were enacted against all nonconformists. The Conventicle Act (1664) made it a crime for five persons or more, "over and above those of the same household," to gather in any house or in any place for worship, unless the service was conducted according to the forms of the Church of England.

The Five-Mile Act (1665) forbade any nonconformist minister who refused to swear that it is unlawful to take arms against the king under any circumstances, and that he never would attempt to make any change in Church or state government, to approach, "unless only in passing upon the road," within five miles of any city, corporate town, or borough sending members to Parliament, or of any place where he had once ministered.

491. **The Covenanters.** — In Scotland the attempt to suppress conventicles and introduce Episcopacy was stoutly resisted by the Covenanters (sec. 466) who insisted on their right to worship God in their own way. They were therefore subjected to persecutions most cruel and unrelenting. They were hunted by English troopers over their native moors and among the wild recesses of their mountains, whither they secretly retired for prayer and worship. The tales of the sufferings of the Scotch Covenanters at the hands of the English Protestants form a most harrowing chapter of the records of the ages of religious persecution.

492. **The Dutch War, the Fire, and the Plague.** — The years from 1664 to 1667 were crowded with calamities, — with war, plague, and fire. The poet Dryden not inaptly calls the year 1666, in which the Great Fire at London added its horrors and losses to those of pestilence and war, the *Annus Mirabilis*, or "Year of Wonders."

The war alluded to was a struggle between the English and the Dutch, which grew out of commercial rivalries (1664–1667). In the first year of this contest the English took New Amsterdam in America away from the Dutch, and changed its name to New York in honor of the king's brother, the Duke of York. In the year 1667 the Dutch fleet entered the estuary of the Thames, burned some English ships, and threatened London. This was the first time a hostile vessel had floated on that river since the days of the Vikings. The English felt deeply the humiliation. It was, writes a contemporary, John Evelyn, "a dreadful spectacle as ever Englishman saw, and a dishonor never to be wiped off."

Early in the summer of 1665 London was swept by a woeful plague, the most terrible visitation the city had known since the

PLATE VII. — SECTION OF OLD LONDON BRIDGE ABOUT THE YEAR 1600. (From a contemporary drawing)

The construction of this bridge was begun in the year 1176 and completed in 1209. For centuries it was "one of the sights of Europe." About midway in the picture is seen Traitors' Gate, where the heads of traitors were exposed. In the lower right-hand corner are several corn mills with their great water wheels. The revenue from the various structures on the bridge seems to have been usually devoted to its maintenance

Black Death in the Middle Ages (sec. 217). Within six months one hundred thousand of the population perished.

The plague was followed the next year by a great fire, which destroyed over thirteen thousand houses, eighty-nine churches, and a vast number of public buildings. The disaster was a blessing in disguise. The burned districts were rebuilt in a more substantial way, with broader streets and more airy residences, so that London became a more beautiful and healthful city than would have been possible without the fire.[15]

493. Charles' Intrigues with Louis XIV; the Test Act. — Charles inclined to the Catholic worship, and wished to reëstablish the Catholic Church, because he thought it more favorable than the Anglican to such a scheme of government as he aimed to set up in England. In the year 1670 he made a secret treaty with the French king, the terms and objects of which were most scandalous. In return for aid which he was to render Louis in an attack upon Holland, he was to receive from him a large sum of money, and, in case his proposed declaration in favor of the restoration of the Catholic Church produced any trouble in the island, the aid of French troops. The scheme was never consummated; but these clandestine negotiations, however, becoming an open secret, made the people very uneasy and suspicious.

FIG. 82. — CHARLES II (After the painting by *Sir Peter Lely*)

Under the excitement of the moment, Parliament enacted a so-called Test Act, which excluded Catholics from the House

[15] One of the churches destroyed was St. Paul's Cathedral, which was rebuilt with great magnificence. Its designer was the eminent architect, Sir Christopher Wren, near whose tomb within the building is this inscription: *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice*, "If you seek his monument, look around."

of Lords.[15a] (They had already been shut out from the House of Commons by the oath of supremacy, which was required of commoners though not of peers.) The disability created by this statute was not removed from Catholics until the nineteenth century, — in the reign of George IV (sec. 669).

494. **"The Popish Plot"** (1678). — The excited state of the public mind, owing to the continuance of the king's intrigues with Louis, led to a serious delusion and panic. A rumor was started that the Catholics had planned for England a St. Bartholomew's Day. The king, the members of Parliament, and all Protestants were to be massacred, the Catholic Church was to be reëstablished, and the king's brother James, who was a zealous Catholic, placed on the throne.

Each day the reports of the conspiracy grew more wild and exaggerated. Informers sprang up on every hand, each with a more terrifying story than the preceding. One of these witnesses, Titus Oates by name, a most infamous person, gained an extraordinary notoriety in exposing the imaginary plot. Many Catholics, convicted solely on the testimony of perjured witnesses, became the unfortunate victims of the delusion and fraud.

495. **The Habeas Corpus Act** (1679). — The year following the "Popish Plot" Parliament passed the celebrated Habeas Corpus Act. This statute was intended to render more effectual the ancient and valued writ of habeas corpus, which was designed to protect the personal liberty of Englishmen, but which the king's courts and sheriffs were rendering well-nigh useless through their evasions and shifts. The law, which is based on articles of Magna Carta, is so carefully and ingeniously drawn that it is almost impossible for its provisions to be evaded in any way. It gives every person almost absolute security against illegal detention in prison, and is the strongest safeguard against the attempts of a despotic ruler upon the liberty of those who may have incurred his displeasure. It has been the model of all laws of like import throughout the Anglo-Saxon world.

[15a] An earlier Test Act (1673) excluded Catholics from civil and military offices.

Reign of James the Second (1685–1688)

496. James' Accession; his Despotic Course. — After a reign of just one quarter of a century Charles died in 1685, and was followed by his brother James, whose rule was destined to be short and troubled.[16]

James, like all the other Stuarts, held exalted notions of the divine right of kings to rule as they please, and at once set about carrying out these ideas in a most reckless manner. Notwithstanding he had given solemn assurances that he would uphold the Anglican Church, he straightway set about the reëstablishment of the Catholic worship. He arbitrarily prorogued and dissolved Parliament. He formed a league against his own subjects with Louis XIV. The High Commission Court of Elizabeth, which had been abolished by Parliament, he practically restored in a new tribunal presided over by the infamous Jeffreys.

The despotic course of the king raised up enemies on all sides. No party or sect, save the most zealous Catholics, stood by him. The Tory gentry were in favor of royalty indeed, but not of tyranny. Thinking to make friends of the Protestant dissenters, James issued a decree known as the Declaration of Indulgence, whereby he suspended all the laws against nonconformists. This edict all the clergy were ordered to read from their pulpits. Almost to a man they refused to do so. Seven bishops even dared to send the king a petition and remonstrance against his unconstitutional proceedings.

The petitioners were thrust into the Tower, and soon afterward were brought to trial on the charge of "seditious libel." The nation was now thoroughly aroused, and the greatest excitement prevailed

[16] James was barely seated upon the throne before the Duke of Monmouth, an illegitimate son of Charles II, who had been in exile in the Netherlands, asserted his right to the crown, and at the head of a hundred men invaded England. Thousands flocked to his standard, but in the battle of Sedgemoor (1685) he was utterly defeated by the royal troops. Terrible vengeance was wreaked upon all in any way connected with the rebellion. The notorious Chief Justice Jeffreys, in what were called the "Bloody Assizes," condemned to death 320 persons, and sentenced 841 to transportation. Jeffreys conducted the so-called trials with incredible brutality. See Colby's *Selections from the Sources of English History*, No. 81.

while the trial was progressing. Judges and jury were overawed by the popular demonstration, and the bishops were acquitted.

497. The Revolution of 1688 and the Declaration of Rights. — The crisis which it was easy to see was impending was hastened by the birth of a prince, as this cut off the hope of the nation that the crown upon James' death would descend to his Protestant daughter Mary, now wife of the Prince of Orange, Stadtholder of Holland. The most active of the king's enemies therefore resolved to bring about at once what they had been inclined to wait to have accomplished by his death. They sent an invitation to the Prince of Orange to come over with such force as he could muster and take possession of the government, pledging him the united and hearty support of the English nation. William accepted the invitation and straightway began to gather his fleet and army for the enterprise.

The moment the ships of the Prince touched the shores of the island, the army and people went over in a body to him. The King was absolutely deserted. Flight alone was left him. The queen with her infant child was secretly embarked for France, where the king soon after joined her. The last act of the king before leaving England was to disband the army and fling the Great Seal into the Thames.[17]

Almost the first act of the Prince was to issue a call for a convention to provide for the permanent settlement of the crown. This body met Jan. 22, 1689, and after a violent debate declared the throne to be vacant through James' misconduct and flight. They then resolved to confer the royal dignity upon William and his wife Mary as joint sovereigns of the realm.

But this convention did not repeat the error of the Parliament that restored Charles II and give the crown to the Prince and Princess without proper safeguards and guaranties for the conduct of the government according to the ancient laws of the kingdom. They drew up the celebrated Declaration of Rights, which plainly rehearsed all the old rights and liberties of Englishmen; denied

[17] In France the self-exiled monarch and his family were kindly received by Louis, who kept up for them the shadow of a court in one of the royal palaces near Paris

the right of the king to lay taxes or maintain an army without the consent of Parliament; and asserted that freedom of debate was the inviolable privilege of both the Lords and the Commons. William and Mary were required to accept this declaration, and to agree to rule in accordance with its provisions, whereupon they were declared King and Queen of England (Feb. 13, 1689). In such manner was effected what is known in history as "the Glorious Revolution of 1688."

Literature of the Restoration

498. The Reaction from Puritanism; Record of this Reaction in the Literature of the Period. — The reigns of the restored Stuarts mark the most corrupt period in the life of English society. The low standard of morals, and the general profligacy in manners, especially among the higher classes, are in part attributable to the demoralizing example of a shockingly licentious and shameless court; but in a larger measure, perhaps, should be viewed as the natural reaction from the over-stern, repellant Puritanism of the preceding period. The Puritans undoubtedly erred in their indiscriminate and wholesale denunciation of all forms of harmless amusement and innocent pleasure. They not only rebuked gaming, drinking, and profanity, and stopped bear baiting,[18] but they closed all the theaters, forbade the Maypole dances of the people, condemned as paganish the observance of Christmas, frowned upon sculpture as idolatrous and indecent, and considered any color or adornment in dress as utterly incompatible with a proper sense of the seriousness of life.

Now all this was laying too heavy a burden upon human nature. The revolt and reaction came, as come they must. Upon the Restoration, society swung to the opposite extreme. In place of the solemn-visaged, psalm-singing Roundhead, we have the gay, roistering Cavalier. Faith gives place to infidelity, sobriety to drunkenness, purity to profligacy, economy to extravagance, Bible

[18] Macaulay humorously insists that the Puritans opposed bear baiting not because it gave pain to the bear but because it gave pleasure to the spectator.

study, psalm singing, and exhorting to theater going, profanity, and carousing.'

The literature of the age is a perfect record of this revolt against the "sour severity" of Puritanism, and a faithful reflection of the unblushing immorality of the times. The book most read and praised by Charles II and his court, and the one that best represents the spirit of the victorious party, was the satirical poem of *Hudibras* by Samuel Butler. The object of the work was to satirize the cant and excesses of Puritanism, just as the *Don Quixote* of Cervantes burlesques the extravagances and follies of chivalry. Butler, however, displays a spirit of vindictiveness and hatred towards the object of his wit of which we find no trace in the good-natured Spanish humorist.

So immoral and indecent are the works of the writers for the stage of this period that these authors have acquired the designation of "the corrupt dramatists." Holding a prominent place among them was the poet Dryden.

IV. Reign of William and Mary (1689–1702)

499. **The Bill of Rights** (Dec. 16, 1689). — The Revolution of 1688 and the settlement of the crown upon William and Mary marks an epoch in the constitutional history of England. It settled forever the long dispute between king and Parliament, — and settled it in favor of the latter. The Bill of Rights, which was substantially the articles of the Declaration of Rights framed into a law, and which was one of the earliest acts of the first Parliament under William and Mary, in effect "transferred sovereignty from the king to the House of Commons."

By shutting out James from the throne and bringing in William, and by the exclusion of Catholic heirs from the succession, it plainly announced that the kings of England derive their right and title to rule not from the accident of birth but from the will of the people, and that Parliament may depose any king, and, excluding from the throne his heirs, settle the crown anew in another family. This uprooted quite thoroughly the doctrine that

princes have a divine and inalienable right to the throne of their ancestors, and when once seated on that throne rule simply as the vicegerents of God, above all human censure and control. We shall hear constantly less and less in England of this theory of government which for so long a time overshadowed and threatened the freedom of the English people.

The separate provisions of the bill, following closely the language of the Declaration, denied the dispensing power of the crown, — that is to say, the authority claimed by the Stuarts of annulling a law by a royal edict; forbade the king to usurp the functions of the courts of justice, to levy taxes, or to keep an army in time of peace without the consent of Parliament; asserted the right of the people to petition for redress of grievances and freely to choose their representatives; reaffirmed, as one of the ancient privileges of both Houses, perfect freedom of debate; and demanded that Parliament should be frequently assembled.

Mindful of Charles' attempt to reëstablish the Catholic worship, the framers of this same Bill of Rights further declared that all persons holding communion with the Church of Rome or uniting in marriage with a Catholic should be "forever incapable to possess, inherit, or enjoy the crown and government of the realm." Since the Revolution of 1688 no Catholic has worn the English crown.

All of these provisions now became inwrought into the English constitution, and from this time forward were recognized as part of the fundamental law of the realm.

500. **Settlement of the Revenue.** — The articles of the Bill of Rights were made effectual by appropriate legislation. One thing which had made the Tudors and Stuarts so independent of Parliament was the custom which prevailed of granting to each king, at the beginning of his reign, the ordinary revenue of the kingdom during his life. This income, with what could be raised by gifts, benevolences, monopolies, and similar expedients, had enabled despotically inclined sovereigns to administer the government, wage war, and engage in any wild enterprise just as individual caprice or ambition might dictate. All this was now changed.

Parliament, instead of granting William the revenue for life, restricted the grant to a single year, and made it a penal offense for the officers of the treasury to pay out money otherwise than ordered by Parliament.

We cannot overestimate the importance of this change in the English constitution. It is this control of the purse of the nation which has made the House of Commons — for all money bills must originate in the Lower House — the actual seat of government, constituting them the arbiters of peace and war.[19]

501. James attempts to recover the Throne: Battle of the Boyne (1690). — The first years of William's reign were disturbed by the efforts of James to regain the throne which he had abandoned. In these attempts he was aided by Louis XIV, and by the Jacobites,[20] the name given to the adherents of the exile king. The Irish gave William the most trouble, but in the decisive battle of the Boyne he gained a great victory over them.

The results of the battle of the Boyne broke the spirit of the revolt, and soon all Ireland acknowledged the authority of William. The Protestant Irish, or Orangemen, as they are called, still keep fresh the memory of the great victory by the celebration, even in the cities of the New World, of the anniversary of the event.

502. Plans and Death of William. — The motive which had most strongly urged William to respond to the invitation of the English revolutionists to assume the crown of England was his desire to turn the arms and resources of that country against the great champion of despotism and the dangerous neighbor of his own native country, Louis XIV of France.

The conduct of Louis in lending aid to James in his attempt to regain his crown had so enraged the English that they were quite ready to support William in his wars against him, and so

[19] The most important constitutional matter of William's reign after those mentioned in the text were the passage by Parliament of the Mutiny Bill, by which the command of the army was given to the king for one year only, and of the act of Settlement (June 12, 1701), which was "an act for the further limitation of the crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subject." The most important article of this act, after that determining the succession, was one providing that the judges should hold office during good behavior, not simply at the will of the king, as hitherto.

[20] From *Jacobus*, Latin for "James."

the English and Dutch sailors fought side by side against the common enemy in the War of the Palatinate (sec. 450).

A short time after the Peace of Ryswick, broke out the War of the Spanish Succession (sec. 451). In the midst of preparations for this war William was fatally hurt by being thrown from his horse (1702).

A contemporary, Bishop Burnet, speaks as follows of King William and his place among English sovereigns: "I considered him as a person raised up by God to resist the power of France and the progress of tyranny and persecution. . . . After all the abatements that may be allowed for his errors and faults, he ought still to be reckoned among the greatest princes that our history, or indeed that of any other, affords." [21]

Selections from the Sources. — In opposition to FILMER, *Patriarcha* (see Sources for Chapter XXVI), read MILTON, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates.* Of the utmost importance for the period of the Civil War and the Commonwealth are *The Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, with elucidations by Thomas Carlyle (ed. by S. C. Lomas). For additional material see HENDERSON, *Side Lights on English History*, pp. 33–214; LEE, *Source-Book*, pp. 335–438; COLBY, *Selections*, Nos. 68–85; and KENDALL, *Source-Book*, chaps. xi–xv.

Secondary Works. — GARDINER, *History of England; History of the Great Civil War; History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate; Oliver Cromwell*, and *The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution, 1603-1660.* Dr. Gardiner made this period especially his own. His works are of the highest authority and value. MACAULAY, *The History of England from the Accession of James II;* also his *Essays* on Milton and John Hampden. GOLDWIN SMITH, *Three English Statesmen;* for two lectures on Pym and Cromwell. MORLEY, *Oliver Cromwell;* HARRISON, *Oliver Cromwell.* HALE, *The Fall of the Stuarts.* AIRY, *The English Restoration and Louis XIV.* WAKEMAN, *The Church of the Puritans.* PRENDERGAST, *The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland.* The admirable articles in the *Dictionary of National Biography* should not be overlooked.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The character and traits of James I and his *Dæmonologie.* 2. The Plantation of Ulster in Ireland. 3. Thomas Wentworth (Earl of Strafford). 4. The Irish "Cromwellian Settlement." 5. Milton's *Defense of the English People.* 6. The Great Plague. 7. Butler's *Hudibras.*

[21] Mary had preceded William, having died in 1694, and as they left no children, the crown descended to the Princess Anne, Mary's sister, the wife of Prince George of Denmark.

CHAPTER XXIX

THE RISE OF RUSSIA: PETER THE GREAT (1682–1725)

503. **General Remarks.** — We left Russia at the close of the Middle Ages a semi-savage, semi-Asiatic power, so hemmed in by barbarian bands and hostile races as to be almost entirely cut off from intercourse with the civilized world (sec. 266). In the present chapter we shall tell how her boundaries were pushed out to the sea on every side, — to the Caspian, to the Euxine, and to the Baltic, — and how she was initiated as a member of the European family of nations. The main interest of our story will gather about Peter the Great, whose almost superhuman strength and energy it was that first lifted the great barbarian nation to a prominent place among the Western states.

504. **Ivan the Terrible** (1533–1584). — The most noteworthy name among the rulers of Russia after the opening of the modern era is that of Ivan IV, surnamed "the Terrible," on account of his many cruel and revengeful acts. While yet a child of thirteen years he caused a boyar, or noble, who had offended him, to be torn in pieces in his presence by dogs. Towards the close of his reign he killed his eldest son with a blow of his iron staff. At Novgorod, in punishment for a supposed conspiracy of the nobles, he put to death over fifteen hundred persons.

But Ivan, despite his terribly cruel disposition, did much to extend and consolidate the Russian dominions. He wrested from the Tartars Kazan (1552) and Astrakhan (1554), and thus gained possession of the entire length of the Volga, — the most important highway of commerce within the Russian Empire, — and extended the limits of his dominions to the shores of the Caspian. "In the Russian annals," says Rambaud, "the expedition to Kazan occupies the same glorious place as the defeat

of Abderrahman in the history of the Franks." From that day to this Russia has steadily pushed the Turanian peoples back from their conquests in Europe, and as steadily encroached upon their domains in Asia. Even before the death of Ivan the Ural Mountains had been crossed and the conquest of Siberia fairly begun.

In 1547 Ivan assumed at his coronation the title of "Tsar."[1] In adopting this imposing title it was his purpose not only to proclaim the new dignity and power with which favoring fortune had invested the Grand Princes of Moscow but also to give expression to the idea that the Muscovite rulers were the heirs and successors of the Cæsars of Constantinople. He maintained that "if Constantinople had been the second, Moscow was the third Rome, — the living heir of the Eternal City."

505. **Beginning of the House of Románov (1613); Accession of Peter the Great (1682).** — The line of the old Norseman Rurik ended in 1598. Then followed a period of confusion and of foreign invasion known as the "Troublous Times," after which, in 1613, Michael Románov, the first of the family that bears his name, was chosen Tsar. The dynasty thus founded held the throne until the Revolution of March, 1917.

For more than half a century after the accession of the Románovs there is little either in the genius or the deeds of any of the line calculated to draw our special attention. But towards the close of the seventeenth century there ascended the Russian throne "a man of miracles," — a man whose genius and energy and achievements instantly drew the gaze of the world, and who has elicited the admiration and wonder of all succeeding generations. This was Peter I, later to be known as Peter the Great, one of the most remarkable characters of history. He was but seventeen years of age when he assumed the full responsibilities of government.

506. **Peter's Character.** — And here, as Peter steps upon the stage to play his great part in the drama of history, we must notice what sort of man he was.

[1] This was the title given by Russian writers to potentates, in particular to the Cæsars of Rome and Constantinople. Ivan III (1462–1505) had made use of the title in his correspondence, but Ivan IV was the first Russian prince upon whom the title was formally bestowed at his coronation.

Like Philip II of Spain, Peter was the true child of his race. In him all the forces of the Russian race life seem to have been concentrated. "Never," says his latest biographer (Waliszewski), "never have the collective qualities of a nation, good and bad, been so summed up in a single personality, destined to be its historical type. . . . Peter is Russia, — her flesh and blood, her temperament, her virtues, and her vices."

FIG. 83. — PETER THE GREAT. (After a painting by *Karel de Moor*)

Peter has been likened to the legendary heroes of the Russian and the Gothic race. He was a man of elemental forces and passions. He had fits of Berserker rage, — wild frenzies during which the life of no one about him was safe. He indulged in astonishing drinking bouts and delighted in buffoonery and coarse jests.

But over against Peter's vices were set many virtues. He worked strenuously at his kingly trade, not alone from sheer love of work but because work was to him a duty. He was not without truly royal thoughts, like those of the best of the enlightened despots, in regard to the nature of the kingly office. He is said to have uttered this sentiment: "I am the first servant of my people." And this was not a mere sentiment with him, as the following story witnesses. One day he visited a park which he

had made, and was surprised to find no one in it. "Do the people suppose," he inquired, "that I have set so many hands at work and spent so much money simply for my own benefit?" And then he ordered proclamation to be made that the park belonged to the people and that they were to use it as their own.

507. The State of Russia when Peter assumed the Government. — In order to understand what Peter did for Russia we must acquaint ourselves with the condition of the country when he took into his hands the shaping of its destinies.

In the first place, we should note the geographical isolation of Russia. At this time she possessed only one seaport, Archangel, on the White Sea, which harbor for a large part of the year is sealed against vessels by the extreme cold of that high latitude. The Tartars and Turks cut her off from the Black Sea; the territories of the Swedes and the Poles intervened between her and the Baltic. She looked towards Asia, to which continent she in fact belonged. When in 1648 the European states readjusted their affairs in the great Westphalian peace, Russia had no lot or part in the convention, not simply because she had stood aloof from the Thirty Years' War, but also because she was not then regarded as forming a part of Europe.

In the second place, we should recall how Russia had been actually Asiaticized through her long subjection to the Mongol hordes (sec. 175). That tide of conquest, it is true, had now ebbed. But "the flood," as Waliszewski says, "receding from the soil had left behind it, like a heavy deposit, all its stable elements, — forms of government, customs, and habits of thought." The Russia which had emerged was, as our author says, essentially Asiatic and barbarous.

508. Peter's Task; his Programme not wholly Original. — Peter's task was to break Russia's isolation and to undo the work of the Tartar conquerors, — to make again European what they had made Asiatic. Hence one essential part of Peter's programme was to wrest the Euxine from the hands of the Turks and the eastern shores of the Baltic from the grasp of the Swedes. Thus would he gain for Russia her first great need, — access to

the sea. Thus would he break that isolation which had done so much to keep the country in the rear of the nations of Western Europe in the march of progress.

Another essential article of Peter's policy was the introduction into Russia of the ideas, customs, arts, and industries of Western Europe, — in a word, to make Russia in her thoughts, ideals, and institutions a member of the European family of nations.

This programme of Peter's, it should be noted, was not wholly original with him. Russia had gradually been preparing for his advent. Her expansion towards water frontiers had already begun. The Caspian had been reached, Siberia had been overrun, and a firm foothold secured on the Pacific shore. Thus Peter simply gave a fresh impulse to an expansion movement already well under way.

It was the same in regard to Peter's internal reforms. The leaven of Western ideas was already working in the mass of Russian conservatism, causing in some minds a great fermentation and calling into existence a party of reform and progress. At Moscow there was a large settlement of foreigners, including German and other merchants, and adventurers from almost every land of the West. It was in the free air of this foreign suburb that Peter, while yet a mere boy, overjoyed to escape from the suffocating atmosphere of the palace, spent much of his time, and here it was that he got his advanced ideas. Among the foreign residents of the palace with whom Peter fraternized were the Swiss Lefort, the Scotch Gordon, and the Dutch Timmermann. Through these and other foreign companions it was that Peter learned how backward and barbarous his own country was compared with the progressive and civilized states of the West.

509. The Conquest of Azov (1696). — In 1695 Peter sailed down the Don and made an attack upon Azov, the key to the Black Sea, but was unsuccessful. The next year, however, repeating the attempt, he succeeded, and thus gained his first harbor on the south.

No sooner had Peter secured his new harbor than he set in earnest about the construction of a marine fleet (1696–1697), in

The
BALTIC LANDS
C. 1701
0 100 200 300 400
Scale of Miles.
Denmark and Norway
Sweden
Poland and Lithuania
Russia
Prussia and Brandenburg
House of Austria
Turks
NORTH SEA
DENMARK
SWEDEN
FINLAND
RUSSIA
POLAND
LITHUANIA
CURLAND
PRUSSIA
BRANDENBURG
SAXONY
SILESIA
BOHEMIA
HUNGARY
VOLHYNIA
RED RUSSIA
PODOLIA
MOLDAVIA
BESSARABIA
Bender
Kiev
Moscow
Smolensk
Vitebsk
Polotsk
Vilna
Grodno
Mobilef
Pskof
Novgorod
Tver
Dorpat
Narva
Revel
Abo
Finland
INGRIA
ESTHONIA
LIVONIA
Riga
Dvina
Wisby
GOTLAND
DAGO
OESEL
Stockholm
Upsala
Trondhjem
Bergen
Fredrikshald
Archangel
White Sea
Dwina R.
Volga R.
Kasan
Bulgar
Saral
Astrakhan
Azov
Sea of Azov
Kuban
Cossacks
(Poltava)
Dnieper R.
Don R.
Dniester R.
Pruth R.
Danube R.
Elbe R.
Oder R.
Vistula R.
Duna R.
Sound
Copenhagen
Malmo
Ystad
Carlscrona
BORNHOLM
Kongelf
Gothenburg
Bahus
Sleswick
HOLSTEIN
Wismar
Hamburg
Bremen
Stettin
Danzig
Elbing
Marienburg
Thorn
Posen
Berlin
Brandenburg
Custrin
Frankfort
Breslau
Glogau
Lublin
Warsaw
Sandomir
Cracow
Leutchen
Jaromirs
Reesbach
Zorndorff
Hudertsburg
Ratisbon
Danube R.
BLACK SEA
CASPIAN SEA

which enterprise he was aided by shipwrights whom he had called from Venice and other Western states. So energetically was the work pushed that in less than two years a great fleet of war ships was floating upon the streams running to the Sea of Azov.

510. Peter's First[2] Visit to the West (1697–1698). — With a view to advancing his naval projects, Peter about this time sent a large number of young Russian nobles to Italy, Holland, and England to acquire in those countries a knowledge of naval affairs, forbidding them to return before they had become good sailors.

Not satisfied with thus sending to foreign parts his young nobility, Peter formed the somewhat startling resolution of going abroad himself and learning the art of shipbuilding by personal experience in the dockyards of Holland. Accordingly, in the year 1697, leaving the government in the hands of three nobles, he set out for the Netherlands.

Peter, with his uncouth barbarian suite, made a great sensation as he traveled westward. His passage with his court was like the passage of a horde of untamed Cossacks. Peter himself often acted like a savage and made his entertainers no end of trouble and anxiety. At Königsberg he asked to see a man broken on the wheel. The authorities explained to him that they were unable to gratify his wish, since there was no criminal at hand condemned to undergo that form of punishment. Peter was astonished that that should stand in the way of his seeing how the instrument worked. "What a fuss about killing a man!" he said.

The palaces in which Peter and his company were lodged were left in a condition that could hardly have been worse had they been subjected to a regular siege. Prudent hosts removed everything breakable from the apartments designed for the accommodation of the "barbarian court."[3]

[2] Peter made a second European tour in 1716–1717.

[3] Wilhelmina, the sister of Frederick the Great of Prussia, who saw Peter and his company at Berlin when the Tsar was on his second visit to the West some years after this, gives in her *Memoirs* the following amusing account of what happened at the summer palace, near the capital, where Peter and his suite were lodged. Recounting the prudent measures taken by the queen to minimize the inevitable damage, she writes: "In order to prevent the mischief which the Russian gentlemen had done in other places where they had lodged, the queen ordered the principal furniture, and

Upon reaching the Netherlands Peter proceeded to Zaandam, a place a short distance from Amsterdam. After a week's stay here, in order to escape the annoyance of the crowds, Peter left the place and went to the docks of the East India Company at Amsterdam, who set about building a frigate that he might see the whole process of constructing a vessel from the beginning. Here he worked for four months, being known among his fellow-workmen as Baas or Master Peter.

It was not alone the art of naval architecture in which Peter interested himself; he attended lectures on anatomy, studied surgery, gained some skill in pulling teeth and in bleeding, inspected paper mills, flour mills, printing presses, and factories, and visited cabinets, hospitals, and museums, thus acquainting himself with every industry and art that he thought might be advantageously introduced into his own country.

From Holland Master Peter went to England to study her superior naval establishment and to learn "the why" and "the wherefore." Here he was fittingly received by King William III, who had presented Peter while in Holland with a splendid yacht fully equipped, and who now made his guest extremely happy by getting up for him a naval review.

While in England Peter gathered a company of several hundred engineers, captains, surgeons, mechanics, and persons learned in the various sciences, and by magnificent promises — which the truth requires us to say were very badly kept — induced them to go to Russia to help him build fleets, train soldiers, cut canals, and Europeanize his country. Returning from England to Holland, Peter went thence to Vienna, intending to visit Venice;

whatever was most brittle, to be removed." And this is what she has to say of the condition of the palace after the Russian guests had left it: "What desolation was there visible! I never beheld anything like it; indeed, I think Jerusalem after its siege and capture could not have presented such another scene. This elegant palace was left by them in so ruinous a state that the queen was absolutely obliged to rebuild the whole of it." A similar story comes from England. The English government lodged Peter and his court in the fine residence of the celebrated writer, John Evelyn. The owner of the premises felt constrained to ask the government to pay for the injury they had sustained. The damages were carefully assessed and amounted to £350 9s. 6d.

but hearing of an insurrection at home, he set out in haste for Moscow.

511. Peter disbands the Streltsi and creates a New Army after Western Models. — The revolt which had hastened Peter's return from the West was an uprising among the Streltsi, a body of militia, numbering twenty or thirty thousand, who formed the nearest thing to a standing Russian army. In their ungovernable turbulence they remind us of the Pretorians of the Roman emperors, or the Janizaries of the later Turkish sultans. The present mutiny had been suppressed before Peter's arrival, so that there was nothing now remaining for him to do save to mete out punishment to the ringleaders, of whom a thousand or more were put to death with the cruelest tortures. Peter beheaded some of the wretches with his own hands, and compelled the nobles of his court also to help strike off the heads of the condemned. Nothing better illustrates the barbarism of the Russia of Peter's time than the fact that his acting thus as an executioner never shocked his subjects in the least.

This revolt settled Peter in his determination to rid himself altogether of the insolent and turbulent Streltsi. A royal edict disbanded those regiments that had had any part in the uprising; a subsequent revolt led to the abolition of the remaining regiments. Thus at a blow did the resolute Peter destroy a power that had come to overshadow the throne itself. The place of the Streltsi was taken by a well-disciplined force trained according to the tactics of the Western nations.

512. Peter's Other Reforms. — The reorganization of the Russian military system was only one of the many reforms undertaken by Peter. The variety of these was so great, and Peter's manner of effecting them so harsh and strenuous, that, as one has aptly expressed it, he fairly "knouted the Russians into civilization."

As outgrowths of what he had seen or heard or had had suggested to him on his foreign tour, Peter issued a new coinage, introduced schools, built factories, constructed roads and canals, established a postal system, opened mines, framed laws modeled after those of the West, and reformed the government of the

towns in such a way as to give the citizens some voice in the management of their local affairs, as he had observed was done in the Netherlands and in England.

Most important in its political as well as religious consequences was Peter's reform in the ecclesiastical system. At this time the Russian Church formed a sort of state within the state. The head of the Church, bearing the title of Patriarch, was a kind of Russian pope. Through his censorship of the temporal authority and his interference in matters secular, he hampered and embarrassed the government. Peter put an end to this state of things. He abolished the patriarchate, and in its place created an administrative body, appointed by himself and called the Holy Synod, to take charge of ecclesiastical affairs. Thus the last restraint upon the authority of the Tsar was destroyed. The Russian government became an unlimited monarchy of the purest Oriental type.

513. Charles XII of Sweden; the Swedish Monarchy at his Accession. — Peter's history now becomes intertwined with that of a man quite as remarkable as himself, — Charles XII of Sweden. Charles was but fifteen years of age when, in 1697, the death of his father called him to the Swedish throne.[4]

Sweden was at this time one of the great powers of Europe. The basis of her greatness had been laid during the period of the Reformation. The traditions of the hero Gustavus Adolphus cast a halo about the Swedish throne. The ideal of this great sovereign had been the creation of a state embracing all the lands bordering upon the Baltic. In a certain measure this magnificent ideal had been realized. The Baltic was virtually a Swedish lake, — the Mediterranean of an empire which aspired to be the mistress of the North.

But unfortunately Sweden could not maintain such a sea empire without hemming in and cramping in their normal development, territorial or commercial, various neighboring states, — in particular

[4] The government of Sweden had now become an absolute autocracy. In 1693 the Riksdag, or Diet, had proclaimed the Swedish monarch to be an "all-commanding sovereign-king responsible for his actions to none on earth, but with authority as a Christian king to rule as it seemeth to him best."

Russia, Poland, and Denmark. In this situation lay hidden the germ of the long and obstinate so-named Swedish Wars, which were essentially a struggle for the control of the Baltic.

The accession to the throne of the young and inexperienced Charles offered to the jealous enemies and watchful rivals of Sweden seemingly too good an opportunity to be lost for pushing her back into the northern peninsula. Accordingly three sovereigns, Frederick IV of Denmark, Augustus the Strong, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, and Peter the Great of Russia, leagued against him for the purpose of appropriating such portions of his dominions as they severally coveted.

514. **The Battle of Narva** (1700). — But the conspirators had formed a wrong estimate of the young Swedish monarch. Notwithstanding the insane follies in which he was accustomed to indulge, he possessed talent; especially had he a remarkable aptitude for military affairs, though lacking many of the qualities of a great commander.

With a well-trained force — a veteran army that had not yet forgotten the discipline of the hero Gustavus Adolphus — Charles now threw himself first upon the Danes, and in two weeks forced the Danish king to sue for peace; then he turned his little army of eight thousand men upon the Russian forces of twenty thousand, which were besieging the city of Narva, on the Gulf of Finland, and inflicted upon them a most ignominious defeat. The only comment of the imperturbable Peter upon the disaster was, "The Swedes will have the advantage of us at first, but they will teach us how to beat them."

515. **The Founding of St. Petersburg** (1703). — After chastising the Tsar at Narva, the Swedish king turned south and marched into Poland to punish Augustus for the part he had taken in the conspiracy against him. While Charles was busied in this quarter, Peter, having made good by strenuous exertions his loss in men and arms at Narva, was gradually making himself master of the Swedish lands on the Baltic, and upon a marshy island at the mouth of the Neva was laying the foundations of the city of Petersburg, which he proposed to make the western gateway of his empire.

The spot selected by Peter as the site of his new capital was low and subject to inundation,[5] so that the labor requisite to make it fit for building purposes was simply enormous. But difficulties never dismayed Peter. He gathered workmen from all parts of his dominions, cut down and dragged to the spot whole forests for piles and buildings, and caused a city to rise as if by magic from the morasses. The splendid capital stands to-day one of the most impressive monuments of the indomitable and despotic energy of Peter.

516. Invasion of Russia by Charles XII; the Battle of Poltáva (1709). — Having defeated the armies of King Augustus and given his crown to another, Charles was now ready to turn his attention once more to the Tsar. With an army of barely forty thousand men he began his eastward march. It soon developed that his bold plan was to strike the ancient capital Moscow, and there to dictate terms of peace.

It was a terrible march that the Swedes made, a march somewhat like that of the Grand Army under Napoleon a century later. The Russian tactics were almost the same now as then, the villages being abandoned and burned, and the entire country made a desert in front of the advancing Swedes.

Thus impeded in his march, Charles suddenly gave up his direct advance upon Moscow and turned south into the Ukraine. Here he finally laid siege to the town of Poltáva. Peter marched to its relief, and the two armies met in decisive combat in front of the place. The Swedish army was virtually annihilated. Escaping with a few followers from the field, Charles fled southward and found an asylum in Turkey.[6]

[5] Peter tells us of an inundation which occurred in 1706. "It was amusing," he writes, "to see how the people sat on roofs and trees, just as in the time of the Deluge." In selecting such a marshy site for his capital, Peter may have been aiming to reproduce Amsterdam, in which city he had spent so much of his time when abroad.

[6] After spending five years among the Turks, during which time he acted in a manner which abundantly justified his title of the "Madman of the North," Charles returned to Sweden. Soon after his return he was killed in battle. At the time of his death Charles was only thirty-six years of age. Perhaps we can understand him best by regarding him, as his biographer Voltaire suggests, as an old Norse sea king born ten centuries after his time. He was indeed "the last of the Vikings."

517. Russia's Title to Baltic Land confirmed; Peter's Death. — In 1721 the Swedish Wars which had so long disturbed Europe were brought to an end by the Peace of Nystad, which confirmed Russia's title to all the eastern Baltic lands that Peter had wrested from the Swedes. The undisputed possession of so large a strip of the Baltic seaboard vastly increased the importance and influence of Russia, which now assumed a place among the leading European powers.

Peter's eventful reign was now drawing to a close. Four years after the end of the Swedish Wars, being then in his fifty-fourth year, he died of a fever brought on by his excesses and careless exposures. It was characteristic of his lack of prudence and foresight that he left no will nor any directions regarding the succession to the throne.

518. Peter's Significance for Russian History. — Probably in the case of no other European nation has any single personality left so deep and abiding an impress upon the national life and history as Peter the Great left upon Russian society and Russian history. He planted throughout his vast empire the seeds of Western civilization, and by his giant strength lifted the great nation which destiny had placed in his hands out of Asiatic barbarism into the society of the European peoples.

But it is the remote influence of Peter's work upon the Russian government which is of special interest to us as students of the Political Revolution. In destroying all checks, military and ecclesiastical, upon the power of the crown, Peter, it is true, rendered the Russian government a perfect despotism of the Asiatic type. But in bringing into his dominions Western civilization, he introduced influences which were destined in time to neutralize all he had done in the way of strengthening the basis of despotism. He introduced a civilization which fosters popular liberties and undermines personal despotic government. "No avowed champion of the people, aided by the most favorable circumstances," says Noble, "could have done such effective battle for Russian liberties as that compassed by the champion of absolute power. . . . Peter was the first to fairly roll Russian

tyranny in the Nessus shirt of European civilization. This was the reformer's real significance for the national life."

519. Reign of Catherine the Great (1762–1796); the Partition of Poland. — From the death of Peter on to the close of the eighteenth century the Russian throne was held, the greater part of the time, by women, the most noted of whom was Catherine II, the Great, who was one of the most distinguished representatives of the so-called enlightened despots (sec. 439). But while a woman of great genius she had most serious faults of character, being incredibly profligate and unscrupulous.

FIG. 84. — CATHERINE II OF RUSSIA. (After a portrait by *Rosselin*)

Carrying out ably the policy of Peter the Great, Catherine extended vastly the limits of Russian dominion and opened the country even more thoroughly than he had done to the entrance of Western influences. She was a genuine admirer of the French philosophers and was at pains to disseminate their teachings in her dominions. Aside from internal reforms, the most noteworthy matters of Catherine's reign were her conquest of the Crimea and her participation in the dismemberment of Poland.

It was in the year 1783 that Catherine effected the subjugation and annexation to Russia of the Crimea. The possession of this peninsula gave Russia dominion on the Black Sea, which once virtually secured by Peter the Great had been again lost through

St. Petersburg
RUSSIA
SWEDEN
BALTIC SEA
Gotland
Gulf of Riga
CURLAND
Riga
Mitau
Libau
R. Duna
To Russia in 1795
To Russia in 1772
Smolensk
Tilsit
Königsberg
R. Niemen
R. Wilna
LITHUANIA
Danzig
POMERANIA
Marienburg
EAST PRUSSIA
WHITE RUSSIA
Grodno
To Prussia in 1772
To Prussia in 1793
Thorn
To Russia in 1795
To Russia in 1793
BLACK RUSSIA
R. Vistula
R. Pripet
Posen
Gnesen
Warsaw
To Prussia in 1793
To Austria in 1795
RED RUSSIA
Lublin
Vladimir
LITTLE RUSSIA
Kiev
R. Oder
Breslau
SILESIA
Cracow
Ratibor
AUSTRIA
LUDOMERIA
Lemberg
To Austria in 1772
Brünn
CARPATHIAN MOUNTAINS
GALICIA
Vienna
R. Dniester
Buda Pest
Theiss
R. Danube
HUNGARY
MOLDAVIA
Odessa
TRANSYLVANIA
THE PARTITION OF POLAND
50 0 50 100 150 200
Scale of Miles.
Territories taken by Russia
Territories taken by Austria
Territories taken by Prussia
BLACK SEA
R. Danube
THE M.-N. WORKS, BUFFALO.

his misfortunes. This extension of the rule of the Muscovite to the Euxine was a matter of great moment to all Eastern Europe; for now, as Freeman says, "the road through which so many Turanian invaders had pressed into the Aryan continent was blocked forever."

On the West Catherine succeeded, by intrigue and the most shameful disregard of the law of nations, in greatly extending the limits of her dominions. This she effected at the expense of Poland, the partition of which state she planned in connection with Frederick the Great of Prussia and Maria Theresa of Austria. On the first division, which was made in 1772, the royal robbers each took a portion of the spoils. This act of brigandage was consummated in spite of the efforts of patriotic Poles for reform, the anarchical condition of the Polish state being the pretext of the despoiling sovereigns for their action.[7]

It is difficult to apportion the blame among the participators in this transaction. Maria Theresa seems to have been the only one connected with the iniquitous business who had any scruples of conscience respecting the act. She justly characterized the proposed partition as downright robbery, for a long time stood out against it, and yielded at last and took her portion only when she realized that she was powerless to prevent the others from carrying out the policy of dismemberment.

In 1793 a second partition was made, this time between Russia and Prussia; and then, in 1795, after the suppression of a determined

[7] The Polish constitution was a survival of the age of mediæval feudal anarchy. In the struggle here between the royal power and the feudal nobility the aristocracy had triumphed, and had reduced the kingly authority to the mere shadow of elective kingship. One particular source of the anarchical state of things was a provision of the constitution which gave to every single member of the Diet the right and power to defeat any measure by his vote cast in opposition (*liberum veto*). Every noble was virtually a king. But it must be added that this anarchical state of the kingdom cannot be pleaded by the dismemberers of Poland in extenuation of their crime, for they in every possible way prevented all schemes of reform and fostered the anarchy because it served their interests and furthered their plans to do so. Louis XIV of France gave his ambassador these instructions: "The government of Poland must be regarded as an anarchy; but this anarchy serves the interests of France, and so it must be fostered." Further, an admirable new constitution was drawn up for Poland in 1791, which would have made it a strong state had a chance been allowed.

revolt of the Poles under the lead of the patriot Kosciuszko, a third and final division among the three powers completed the dismemberment of the unhappy state and erased its name from the map of Europe.

This was the first instance in two hundred years of the destruction of a sovereign Christian state by sister states. Unfortunately the pages of the history of the following century were to be stained with the record of many similar acts of international brigandage, yet by none quite as wicked or as far-reaching in its regrettable consequences as was this assassination of Poland.

The territory gained by Russia in the dismemberment of Poland brought her western frontier close alongside the civilization of Central Europe. In Catherine's phrase, Poland had become her "door mat," upon which she stepped when visiting the West.

By the close of Catherine's reign Russia was beyond question one of the foremost powers of Europe, and was henceforward to have a voice in all matters of general European concern. She was destined to play an important part in the Napoleonic Wars and in the great struggle between the people and their despotic rulers, — a struggle already inaugurated on the Continent by the Revolutionists in France.

Selections from the Sources. — SIGISMUND VON HERBERSTEIN, *Notes upon Russia* (Hakluyt Society publications). The author of these valuable "Notes" was a German ambassador at the Russian court during the years 1517–1526.

Secondary Works. — RAMBAUD, *History of Russia.* This is the best comprehensive history of Russia available in English. SCHUYLER, *Peter the Great, Emperor of Russia.* The best biography of the great Tsar. For a shorter, delightfully written life, see MOTLEY, *Peter the Great.* MORFILL, *Story of Russia*, chaps. v–ix, and *Story of Poland*, chap. xi; the last for the Partition of Poland. BAIN, *Charles XII.* There have recently appeared from the pen of a brilliant writer biographies of Peter the Great and Catherine II, but unfortunately they are works which cannot be recommended as wholesome reading for the young, or as impartial history.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Geography of the Russian Empire. 2. Ivan the Terrible. 3. Peter's boyhood. 4. The founding of St. Petersburg. 5. Charles XII at Bender in Turkey. 6. Peter and his son and heir Alexis. 7. Catherine the Great and the Partition of Poland.

CHAPTER XXX

THE RISE OF PRUSSIA: FREDERICK THE GREAT (1740–1786)

520. The Beginnings of Prussia. — The foundation of the Prussian kingdom was laid in the beginning of the seventeenth century (in 1611) by the union of two small states south of the Baltic, one in Germany and one in Poland. These were the Electorate of Brandenburg and the Duchy of Prussia. Brandenburg had been gradually growing into prominence since the tenth century. Its ruler at the time of the union was a prince of the noted House of Hohenzollern, and was one of the seven princes to whom belonged the right of electing the Emperor.

Prussia, so called from the Borussi, a tribe of desperate heathen of Lithuanian race, was a small state lying along the Baltic shore in Poland, east of the Vistula. It had been conquered by the valor of the Teutonic Knights in the thirteenth century, and during this and the following centuries had been gradually Germanized (sec. 154).

521. The Great Elector Frederick William (1640–1688). — Although this new Prussian power was destined to become the champion of German Protestantism, it acted a very unworthy and vacillating part in the Thirty Years' War. But just before the close of that struggle a strong man came to the throne, — Frederick William, better known as the "Great Elector." He infused vigor and strength into every department of the state and acquired such a position for his government that at the Peace of Westphalia he was able to secure new territory, which greatly enhanced his power and prominence among the German princes.

The Great Elector ruled for nearly half a century, and left to his successor a strongly centralized authority. He was one of the

most ideal representatives of the principle of absolute monarchy then so dominant. Like all absolute rulers, he placed his faith in soldiers, and laid the basis of the military power of Prussia by the creation of a standing army.

522. **How the Elector of Brandenburg acquired the Title of King.** — Elector Frederick III (1688–1713), son of the Great Elector, was ambitious for the title of King, a dignity that the weight and influence won for the Prussian state by his father fairly justified him in seeking. He saw about him other princes less powerful than himself enjoying this dignity, and he too "would be a king and wear a crown."

It was necessary of course for Frederick to secure the consent of the Emperor, a matter of some difficulty, for the Catholic advisers of the Austrian court were bitterly opposed to having an heretical prince thus honored and advanced. But the War of the Spanish Succession was just about to open, and the Emperor was extremely anxious to secure Frederick's assistance in the coming struggle. Therefore, on condition of his furnishing him aid in the war, the Emperor consented to Frederick's assuming the new title and dignity *in the Duchy of Prussia*, which, unlike Brandenburg, was not included in the Empire. Accordingly, early in the year 1701, Frederick, amidst imposing ceremonies, was crowned and hailed as King at Königsberg. Hitherto he had been Elector of Brandenburg and Duke of Prussia; now he was Elector of Brandenburg and King of Prussia.

Thus was a new king born among the kings of Europe. Thus did the House of Hapsburg invest with royal dignity the rival House of Hohenzollern. The event is a landmark in German, and even in European, history. The cue of German history from this on is the growth of the power of the Prussian kings and their steady advance to imperial honors and to the control of the affairs of the German race.

523. **Frederick William I** (1713–1740). — The son and successor of the first Prussian king, known as Frederick William I, was a most extraordinary character. He was a strong, violent, brutal man, full of the strangest freaks, yet in many respects just

the man for the times. He despised culture and treated scholars with studied contempt, being reported as having declared that "a pinch of common sense was worth a university full of learning." He would tolerate no idlers. He carried a long cane, which he laid upon the back of every unoccupied person he chanced to meet, whether man, woman, or child.

Frederick William had a mania for big soldiers. With infinite expense and trouble he gathered a regiment of the tallest men he could find, who were known as the "Potsdam Giants," — a regiment numbering twenty-four hundred men. Not only were the Goliaths of his own dominions impressed into the service, but tall men in all parts of Europe were coaxed and hired to join the regiment. No present was so acceptable to him as a tall grenadier. The Princess Wilhelmina, referring to her father's ruling passion, says: "This regiment might justly be styled 'the channel of royal favor,' for to give or to procure tall men for the king was sufficient to obtain anything of him." On the other hand, nothing angered him more than any interference with his recruiting service. To the Dutch, who had hanged two of his recruiting sergeants and then later wanted from Prussia a famous scholar for one of their universities, he is said to have replied curtly, "No tall fellows, no professor."

Considering the trouble and expense Frederick William had in collecting his giants, the care which he took of them was quite natural. He looked after them as tenderly as though they were infants, and was very careful never to expose them to the dangers of a battle.

Notwithstanding Frederick William was so eccentric in many of his public acts, and in his domestic relations was a perfect savage, in the general administration of his government he evinced such energy and good judgment that he is admitted to have been one of the greatest administrators of his age. He did very much to consolidate the power of Prussia, and at his death in 1740 left to his successor a considerably extended dominion and a splendidly drilled army which he had increased from thirty-five thousand to eighty thousand men.

524. **Accession of Frederick the Great (1740); his Youth.** — Frederick William was followed by his son Frederick II, more generally known as Frederick the Great. Like his father he was a soldier, but unlike him he was fond of music and literature and keenly interested in the economic welfare of his subjects. Around his name gather events of world-wide interest for forty-six years just preceding the French Revolution.

It was a rough nurture Frederick had received in the home of his brutal father. His sister Wilhelmina tells incredible tales of her own and her brother's treatment at the hands of their savage parent. He made the palace a veritable hell for them both. He threw plates from the table at their heads and kept them in constant fear for their lives. Frederick's fine tastes for music and art and reading exposed him in particular, to use the words of Wilhelmina, to his royal father's "customary endearments with his fist and cane."

Frederick had a genius for war, and his father had prepared to his hand one of the most efficient instruments of that art since the time of the Roman legions. "The Prussian battalion," says Frederick, speaking of the army he had inherited from his parental drillmaster, "had become a walking battery." One Prussian, he asserts, was equal to three adversaries.

The two great wars in which Frederick was engaged, and which raised Prussia to a rank among the great military powers of Europe, were the War of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years' War.

525. **War of the Austrian Succession (1740–1748).** — Through the death of Charles VI the imperial office became vacant in the very year that Frederick II ascended the Prussian throne. Charles was the last of the direct male line of the Hapsburgs, and disputes straightway arose respecting the succession to the dominions of the House of Austria, which resulted in the long struggle known as the War of the Austrian Succession.

Now, not long before his death Charles had bound all the different states of his dominion and all the leading powers of Europe to a sort of agreement called the Pragmatic Sanction, by

NORTH SEA
DENMARK
SWEDEN
BALTIC SEA
SLESWICK
HOLSTEIN
R. Elbe
R. Niemen
Königsberg
EAST PRUSSIA
Marienburg
POMERANIA
MECKLENBURG
Hamburg
EAST FRIESLAND
NETHERLANDS
HANOVER
BRANDENBURG
Berlin
Potsdam
Küstrin
R. Vistula
Warsaw
POLAND
MINDEN
RAVENSBERG
BRUNSWICK
CLEVE
GULDERLAND
MARK
R. Rhine
SAXONY
Dresden
Breslau
Oder
SILESIA
BAYREUTH
BOHEMIA
PALATINATE
ANSPACH
BADEN
WÜRTEMBERG
BAVARIA
50°
54°
8°
12°
16°
20°
PRUSSIA
at the Accession of
FREDERICK THE GREAT
in 1740
0 50 100
Scale of Miles

NORTH SEA
DENMARK
SWEDEN
BALTIC SEA
SLESWICK
HOLSTEIN
R. Elbe
R. Niemen
Königsberg
EAST PRUSSIA
Danzig
POMERANIA
Marienburg
WEST PRUSSIA
MECKLENBURG
Hamburg
EAST FRIESLAND
NETHERLANDS
HANOVER
BRANDENBURG
Berlin
Potsdam
R. Vistula
Warsaw
POLAND
MINDEN
RAVENSBERG
BRUNSWICK
CLEVE
GULDERLAND
MARK
R. Rhine
Aix-la-Chapelle
Hubertsburg
Rossbach
SAXONY
Dresden
Oder
Breslau
Leuthen
Mollwitz
SILESIA
Frankfort
BAYREUTH
Prague
Kolin
BOHEMIA
MORAVIA
PALATINATE
ANSPACH
BADEN
WÜRTEMBERG
BAVARIA
Munich
THE M^N. WORKS
50°
54°
8°
12°
16°
20°
PRUSSIA
at the Death of
FREDERICK THE GREAT
in 1786
0 50 100
Scale of Miles

the terms of which, in case he should leave no son, all his hereditary dominions — that is, the kingdom of Hungary, the kingdom of Bohemia, the archduchy of Austria, and the other possessions of the House of Austria — should descend to his elder daughter, Maria Theresa. Accordingly, upon the death of Charles these dominions passed to the archduchess, who was now called Queen of Hungary, that being the highest title of all those which she was entitled to bear.[1]

Solemnly as the powers of Europe had agreed to maintain the Pragmatic Sanction, no sooner was Charles dead than Bavaria, Spain, Sardinia, and Saxony each laid claim to all or to portions of the Hapsburg inheritance. France, quite willing to aid in the dismemberment of Austria, supported the pretensions of Bavaria. Before any of these claimants, however, had begun hostilities, Frederick, — whose father had guaranteed the Pragmatic Sanction, — without any declaration of war, marched his army into Silesia and took forcible possession of that country. Frederick's act was an act of pure brigandage. He himself frankly tells posterity that the mixed motive under which he acted was a desire to augment his dominions, to render himself and Prussia respected in Europe, and to acquire fame.

Thus stripped of one of her fairest provinces, Maria Theresa finally appealed to the Hungarian nobility to avenge her wrongs. They were at this time discontented because certain of their rights had not been respected. By restoring or confirming all their ancient liberties, the queen gained their ardent and loyal support.

England, the Protestant Netherlands, and eventually Russia were drawn into the war as allies of Maria Theresa. The theater of the struggle came to embrace India and the French and English colonies in the New World. Macaulay's well-known words picture the world-wide range of the conflagration which Frederick's act had kindled: "In order that he might rob a neighbor,"

[1] The imperial crown could not of course be worn by her. This was given by the Electors to Charles Albert, Elector of Bavaria, who became Emperor Charles VII (1742). Three years later Charles died and the husband of Maria Theresa was raised by the Electors to the imperial throne as Emperor Francis I.

he says, "whom he had promised to defend, black men fought on the coast of Coromandel, and red men scalped each other by the Great Lakes of North America."

The war went on until 1748, when it was closed by the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. Carlyle's summing up of the provisions of the various treaties of this peace can be easily remembered, and is not misleading as to the essentials: "To Frederick, Silesia; as to the rest, wholly as they were."

526. **The Seven Years' War** (1756–1763). — The eight years of peace which followed the War of the Austrian Succession were improved by Frederick in developing the resources of his kingdom and perfecting the organization and discipline of his army. During this time Maria Theresa was busy forming a league of the chief European powers against the unscrupulous despoiler of her dominions. Russia, Sweden, many of the states of the Germanic body, and even France, who now abandoned her traditional policy of opposition to the House of Austria, — all ultimately entered into an alliance with the empress queen. Frederick could at first find no ally save England; — towards the close of the war Russia came for a short time to his side, — so that he was left almost alone to fight the combined armies of half the Continent.[2] Throughout the struggle Prussia was scarcely more than a "Spartan camp."

The long war is known in European history as the Seven Years' War. At the very outset it became mixed with what in American history is called the French and Indian War, which had practically begun with the disastrous defeat of Braddock in 1755.

At first the fortunes of the war were all on Frederick's side. In the celebrated battles of Rossbach, Leuthen, and Zorndorf he defeated successively the French, the Austrians, and the Russians. These successes revealed the fact that the armies of Prussia had at their head a commander whose very ability made him a dangerous force in Europe. His name became everywhere a household word, and everybody coupled with it the epithet of Great.

[2] The population of Prussia at this time was about 5,000,000; the aggregate population of the states leagued against her is estimated at 100,000,000.

But fortune finally deserted him. In sustaining the unequal contest his dominions became drained of men; England withdrew her aid,[8] and inevitable ruin seemed to impend over his throne and kingdom. He himself despaired of being able much longer to hold his enemies at bay, and carried about his person poison to use when the last effort should have been made.



FIG. 85. — MARIA THERESA

A change by death in the government of Russia now put a new face upon Frederick's affairs. In 1762 Empress Elizabeth of that country died, and Peter III, an ardent admirer of Frederick, came to the throne, and immediately transferred the armies of Russia from the side of the allies to that of Prussia. "Together we will conquer the whole world," was the sanguine declaration of the Tsar as he joined his forces to those of his friend.

The alliance lasted only a few months, Peter being deposed and murdered by his wife, who now came to the throne as Catherine II. She adopted a neutral policy and recalled her armies; but the temporary alliance had given Frederick a decisive advantage, and the year following the defection of Russia, England and France were glad to give over the struggle and sign the Peace of Paris

[8] William Pitt (later, Earl of Chatham) fell from power in 1761, and his policy of fighting France by helping Frederick was abandoned. Consult sec. 540.

(1763). Shortly after this another peace (the Treaty of Hubertsburg) was arranged between Austria and Prussia, and one of the most terrible wars that had ever disturbed Europe was over. Silesia was left in the hands of Frederick.

The Seven Years' War was one of the decisive combats of history. Besides the Anglo-French question in India (sec. 540), it settled two questions of vast reach and significance. First, it settled, or at least put in the way of final settlement, the Austro-Prussian question, — the question as to whether Austria or Prussia should be leader in Germany. It made Prussia the equal of Austria and foreshadowed her ascendancy.

Second, it settled the Anglo-French question in America, a question like the Austro-Prussian question in Europe. It decided that North America should belong to the Protestant Anglo-Saxon, and not to the Catholic Latin, race.

Thus, though the war was in no sense a religious war, still the outcome of the tremendous struggle was the humiliation of two Catholic states, Austria and France, and the lifting into prominence of two Protestant states, Prussia and England. There was in this vast significance for both Old and New World history.

527. **Frederick rounds out his Dominions at the Expense of Poland.** — It was about a decade after the close of the Seven Years' War that Frederick, as has already been related, joined with Catherine II of Russia and Maria Theresa of Austria in the First Partition of Poland (sec. 519).

Respecting the value to Prussia of the territory she received in this transaction, Frederick in his *History of my Own Times* comments as follows: "This was one of the most important acquisitions we could possibly make, because it joined Pomerania and Eastern Prussia (see map, p. 472), and, by rendering us masters of the Vistula, we gained the double advantage of being able to defend this kingdom and of levying very considerable tolls on the Vistula, the whole trade of Poland being carried on upon that river." But this aggrandizement of Prussia was secured only by just such a cynical disregard of international honesty by Frederick as marked his annexation of Silesia.

528. Frederick as an Enlightened Despot. — Frederick in all his relations to his own subjects had a wholly different moral standard from that which he adopted in his dealings with his brother sovereigns. In all matters concerning foreign states, expediency was his only guide; he did whatever he thought would aggrandize Prussia and glorify himself, without any regard to truth, honesty, or honor. But for his guidance in his relations to his own people he had a different code. Despotic though he always was, yet on the whole he made such use of his absolute power that he has been numbered among the enlightened despots of the eighteenth century. Professor Morse Stephens illustrates the difference between the despotism of Louis XIV and that of Frederick by thus setting in contrast their respective maxims: "Louis said, 'I am the State'; Frederick said, 'I am the first servant of the State.'"

During the intervals of peace between his great wars, and for the half of his reign which followed the Peace of Hubertsburg, Frederick labored untiringly to develop the resources of his dominions and to promote the material welfare of his kingdom. He dug canals, constructed roads, drained marshes, encouraged agriculture and manufactures, and improved in every possible way the administration of the government.

Yet in everything he did Frederick showed the true Hohenzollern spirit. He had no confidence in the ability or the intelligence of the common people and took no steps to educate or train them to be more useful citizens. On the contrary, he taught them to look to the government for all their well-being without expecting or even desiring to have any share in the government themselves. Even the nobility was not called on for much assistance, and the ministers did little more than register the king's will.

But Frederick's attention was not wholly engrossed with looking after the material well-being of his subjects. He was a philosopher and believed himself to be a poet, and usually spent several hours each day in philosophical and literary pursuits. It has been said of him that "he divided with Voltaire the intellectual monarchy of the eighteenth century." He gathered about him a

company selected from among the most distinguished authors, scientists, and philosophers of the age, among whom was his "co-sovereign" Voltaire, whom Frederick coaxed to Berlin to add brilliancy to his court, and to criticise and correct his verses. Frederick felt very proud — for a time — of this acquisition, and rejoiced that to his other titles he could now add that of "the Possessor of Voltaire." But it was an ill-assorted friendship; the two "sovereigns" soon quarreled, and Voltaire was dismissed from court in disgrace.

Frederick was a freethinker. His paganism made him indifferent toward all religions, and hence tolerant. He said in effect, as Carlyle reports him, "In this country every man must get to heaven in his own way." The company which he gathered at Sans Souci, his favorite palace at Potsdam, near Berlin, was a most extraordinary collection of heretics, agnostics, misbelievers, and unbelievers. It was a company very representative of that learned literary and philosophical society of the eighteenth century whose ideas and teachings did so much to prepare the way for the French Revolution.

It was on the very eve of this great political and social upheaval that Frederick died, — in 1786. Carlyle calls him "the last of the kings." He was of course not the last in *name*. Only three years after he had been laid in the tomb broke out the revolution which closed the Age of the Kings and ushered in the Age of the People.

529. Summary: Prussia made a New Center of German Crystallization. — This chapter may be summarized in this way. The all-important result of Frederick the Great's strong reign was the making of Prussia the equal of Austria, and thereby the laying of the basis of future German unity. Hitherto Germany had been trying unsuccessfully to concentrate about Austria; now there was a new center of crystallization, — one which was destined to draw to itself the Protestant elements of German nationality.

The internal history of Germany from Frederick's reign on, if we leave out of consideration the period of Napoleon's domination, is very largely the story of the rivalry of these two powers,

resulting in the final triumph of Prussia and the unification of Germany under her leadership, Austria with the mixed races under her rule being pushed out as though entitled to no part in the affairs of the Empire. This story we shall tell in a later chapter.

Selections from the Sources. — *Memoirs of Frederica Sophia Wilhelmina* (Margravine of Baireuth, sister of Frederick the Great). These memoirs form one of the most graphic and piquant autobiographies ever written. They hold striking portraits of the author's savage father, Frederick William I, of her brother, to whom she was devotedly attached, and of many other distinguished contemporaries. But Wilhelmina's lively imagination and her mischievous if not malicious spirit caused her to overcolor and to exaggerate. Consequently the numerous portraits which she delights in sketching, while always interesting and often amusing, are not to be taken too seriously.

Secondary Works. — TUTTLE, *History of Prussia.* This work was unhappily interrupted at the year 1757 by the death of the author. It is the best history in English of the period covered. REDDAWAY, *Frederick the Great and the Rise of Prussia.* CARLYLE, *History of Friedrich the Second.* This is one of Carlyle's masterpieces. Like his French Revolution it will be best appreciated if read after some acquaintance with its subject has been gained from other sources. It deals almost exclusively with Frederick's twenty-three years of war and utterly neglects or minimizes the twenty-three of his reign which were years of peace. HASSALL, *The Balance of Power, 1715–1789,* chaps. vi–ix. LONGMAN, *Frederick the Great and the Seven Years' War.* BRIGHT, *Maria Theresa.* HENDERSON, *A Short History of Germany,* vol. ii, chaps. i–v. MACAULAY, *Essay on Frederick the Great.*

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The Teutonic Knights and the beginnings of Prussia. 2. The Great Elector Frederick William. 3. Character of the father of Frederick the Great. 4. The Regiment of Giants. 5. The Empress-Queen Maria Theresa. 6. Frederick the Great and Voltaire. 7. Frederick the Great as an enlightened despot.

CHAPTER XXXI

ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

I. The Reign of Queen Anne (1702–1714)

530. The Formula for Eighteenth-Century English History. — "The expansion of England in the New World and in Asia," says Professor Seeley, "is the formula which sums up for England the history of the eighteenth century."

This expansion movement was simply the continuation of a trade and commercial development which had begun in the sixteenth century, and which had shaped large sections of the history of England by bringing her into sharp rivalry first with Spain and then with the Dutch Netherlands. Before the close of the seventeenth century England had practically triumphed over both these commercial rivals. Her great and dangerous rival in the eighteenth century was France. "The whole period," says Seeley, referring to the period between 1688 and 1815, "stands out as an age of gigantic rivalry between England and France, a kind of second Hundred Years' War."

To indicate from the viewpoint of English history the chief episodes in this great struggle between the two rivals for supremacy in the commercial and colonial world will be our chief aim in the present chapter. We shall, however, in order to render more complete our sketch of this century of English history, touch upon some other matters of special interest and significance, though connected in no direct manner with the dominant movement of the period.

531. War of the Spanish Succession (1701–1714). — The War of the Spanish Succession covered the whole of the reign of Queen Anne. Respecting the causes and results of this war,

and of England's part in it, we have already spoken in connection with the reign of Louis XIV (sec. 451). Of what was there said we need here recall only the enumeration of the territorial gains which the war, and the Peace of Utrecht which closed it, brought to England; namely, Gibraltar and the island of Minorca in the Old World, and Nova Scotia together with a clear title to Newfoundland and the Hudson Bay Territory in the New.

Of special interest in the present connection is that clause of the treaty between England and Spain whereby England took away from the French and secured for English merchants the contract known as the "Assiento," which gave English subjects the sole right for thirty years of shipping annually forty-eight hundred African slaves to the Spanish colonies in America.[1] This slave trade was as lucrative a traffic as the old spice trade, and at this time was some such object of rivalry among the commercial states of Europe as that had formerly been. The securing of this contract by England made her the chief slave-trading power in the world.

At the same time that England got the Assiento contract she secured from Spain the further right to send each year one vessel on a trading voyage to Spanish America.

Thus as results of the first war of the eighteenth century England had got practical control of the Mediterranean, had secured a monopoly of the lucrative slave trade with the Spanish colonies, had made a beginning of wresting from France her possessions in the New World, and had gained mastery of the seas. "Before the war," says Mahan, "England was one of the sea powers; after it she was *the* sea power, without any second."

532. **Parliamentary Union of England and Scotland (1707).** — The most noteworthy matter in the domestic history of England during the reign of Queen Anne was the union of the Parliaments

[1] The Papal Line of Demarcation (sec. 307) and treaty engagements with the Portuguese shut the Spaniards out from Africa, and hence they had to depend upon intermediaries to fetch them slaves from thence. The Dutch had had the contract before the French. For an account of the Assiento and the economic condition at this time of Spanish America, see Moses, *Establishment of Spanish Rule in America*, chap. xi.

of England and Scotland.[2] This important transaction was closely connected with that commercial and colonial expansion movement which characterized eighteenth-century English history.

At this time England, dealing with Scotland in the same spirit as she dealt with Ireland, by means of navigation laws and high customs duties practically excluded her merchants, as though Scotland were a foreign state, from participation in that commercial prosperity which English traders were enjoying. The Scotch traders were shut out not only from the English colonies but also from the English home market. Scotch trade was thus strangled. In the hope of creating an outlet for their commerce, the Scots undertook to establish a colony of their own on the Isthmus of Panama, or Darien, which was given the name of New Caledonia.[3] The settlement was to be the halfway station between Scotland and the East Indies. The enterprise raised great expectations. The isthmian city was to be the Alexandria of the New World, "the key of the universe."[4] But the spot selected for the settlement proved unhealthy; besides, the Spaniards made trouble and drove out the colonists, claiming that the settlement was an encroachment upon their territory. The outcome was the disastrous failure of the undertaking.

The commercial distress occasioned in Scotland by reason of the miscarriage of this enterprise caused the feeling against England to become more intense than ever, and there were threats of breaking the dynastic ties which united the two countries. The English government, realizing the danger which lurked in the situation, — for the national sentiment in Scotland was still strong, — now met the Scots in a spirit of reasonable compromise. It was agreed that the Parliaments of the two countries should be united; that perfect free trade should be established between them; and that all the English colonies should be open

[2] It was only the *crowns* of the two kingdoms which were united upon the accession of the House of Stuart to the English throne in 1603 (sec. 458).

[3] The promoter of the project was a Scotchman named William Paterson. The active efforts to found the colony covered the years 1698–1700.

[4] The scheme, it will be noted, was substantially only an anticipation of the later unfortunate French Panama Canal project.

to Scotch traders. On this basis was brought about the union of the two realms into a single kingdom under the name of Great Britain (1707). From this time forward the two countries were represented by one Parliament sitting at Westminster.

The union was advantageous to both countries; for it was a union not simply of hands but of hearts. England's constant and costly watch of her northern frontiers through ten centuries against raid and invasion could now be intermitted. As to Scotland, her entrance into England's home and colonial markets, and her participation in English manufacturing and commercial enterprises, resulted in a wonderful expansion of her energies and resources. Manufactories sprang up on every side; insignificant hamlets grew quickly into great centers of industry. Ten years after the union the first Scotch vessel intended for the transatlantic trade was launched on the Clyde. The Clyde to-day is one of the greatest centers of the shipbuilding industry, and Glasgow is one of the largest and most important seaports of the world.

533. **Literature under Queen Anne.** — The reign of Queen Anne was an illustrious one in English literature. Under her began to write a group of brilliant authors whose activity continued on into the reign of her successor, George I. Their productions are, many of them, of special interest to the historian, because during this period there was an unusually close connection between literature and politics. Literature was forced into the service of party. A large portion of the writings of the era was in the form of political pamphlets, wherein all the resources of wit, satire, and literary skill were exhausted in defending or ridiculing the opposing principles and policies of Whig and Tory.

The four most prominent and representative authors of the times were Alexander Pope (1688–1744), Jonathan Swift (1667–1745), Joseph Addison (1672–1719), and Daniel Defoe (1661?–1731).

In the scientific annals of the period the name of Sir Isaac Newton (1642–1727) is most prominent. As the discoverer of the law of gravitation and the author of the *Principia*, his name

will ever retain a high place among the few who belong through their genius or achievements to no single nation or age, but to the world.

534. **Death of Queen Anne; the Succession.** — Queen Anne died in the year 1714, leaving no heirs. In the reign of William a statute known as the Act of Settlement had provided that the crown, in default of heirs of William and Anne, should descend to the Electress Sophia of Hanover (grandchild of James I), or her heirs, "being Protestants." The Electress died only a short time before the death of Queen Anne; so, upon that event, the crown passed to the Electress' eldest son, George, who thus became the founder of a new line of English sovereigns, the House of Hanover, or Brunswick, the family in whose hands the royal scepter still remains.

II. England under the Earlier Hanoverians[5]

535. **The Sovereign's Loss of Political Influence; the Prime Minister and the Cabinet.** — The new Hanoverian king, George I (1714–1727), was utterly ignorant of the language and the affairs of the people over whom he had been called to rule. He was not loved by the English, but he was tolerated by them for the reason that he represented Protestantism and those principles of political liberty for which they had so long battled with their Stuart kings. On account of his ignorance of English affairs the king was obliged to intrust to his ministers the practical administration of the government. The same was true in the case of George II (1727–1760). George III (1760–1820), having been born and educated in England, regained some of the old influence of former kings. But he was the last English sovereign who had any large personal influence in shaping governmental policies.

The power and patronage lost by the crown passed into the hands of the chief minister, popularly called the Prime Minister,

[5] The sovereigns of the House of Hanover are George I (1714–1727), George II (1727–1760), George III (1760–1820), George IV (1820–1830), William IV (1830–1837), Victoria (1837–1901), Edward VII (1901–1910), and George V (1910–).

or Premier, whose tenure of office was dependent not upon the good will of the sovereign but upon the support of the House of Commons. This transfer of power was not made all at once, but by the middle of the eighteenth century it was practically completed, although this fact was not always gracefully and promptly recognized by the crown. In the English government of to-day the Prime Minister is the actual and fully acknowledged executive. The king remains the titular sovereign, indeed, but all real power and patronage are in the hands of the Premier.

The first English Prime Minister in the modern sense was Sir Robert Walpole. He did not exercise all the functions of the Premier of to-day, but his control of affairs and his relation to the dominant party in Parliament were such that to give him this name is not misleading. He was at the head of the government, as the leader of the Whig party, for about twenty-one years (1721–1742). He maintained a favorable majority in Parliament by gifts of office, titles, pensions, and, it is charged, by the grossly corrupt use of the immense secret-service funds of which he had the disposal.[6]

It was during the administration of Sir Robert Walpole that what is known as the Cabinet assumed substantially the form which it has at the present time. This body is practically a committee composed of a dozen or more members of Parliament, headed by the Prime Minister, and dependent for its existence upon the will of the House of Commons. The Premier and his colleagues stand and fall together. When the Cabinet can no longer command a majority in the Commons, its members resign, and a new Prime Minister, appointed nominally by the sovereign, but really by the party in control of the House of Commons, forms a new Cabinet.[7]

536. **"The South Sea Bubble"** (1720–1721). — One of the earliest matters of moment of the Hanoverian period was a

[6] To him has been attributed the cynical saying, "Every man has his price." But he did not utter this "famous slander on mankind." What he actually did say was, "All these men have their price," — referring to a group of his opponents. See Morley, *Walpole*, p. 127; and Lecky, *England in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i, p. 399.

[7] The Cabinet is an essential feature of all modern self-governing states which have constitutions copied after the parliamentary system developed by the English.

financial episode very like that connected with the name of John Law in French history (sec. 457). The affair grew directly out of the treaty arrangements which closed the War of the Spanish Succession. As we have seen, England then secured certain trading privileges with the Spanish colonies. Now, at this time there were abroad most exaggerated ideas of the wealth of Spanish America, and it was conceived that trading privileges in those parts meant unlimited wealth for everybody sharing them. In anticipation of the treaty there was formed in England a company to engage in trade with the Spanish colonies. The shares of the company were eagerly sought after, and soon began to rise in price like the shares of the famous French Mississippi Company. Other projects were started, and a perfect mania for speculation developed. The outcome could of course have been foreseen. The bubble collapsed, and to the melancholy record of "the Mississippi Bubble" was added that of "the South Sea Bubble."

537. **The War of the Austrian Succession** (1740–1748). — From our present viewpoint we can easily see what was England's main interest in the War of the Austrian Succession (sec. 525). She entered the struggle on the side of Austria especially in order to thwart France in the two ambitious objects which she was then pursuing, namely, to make herself arbiter of Europe through the dismemberment of the Austrian monarchy, and to gain supremacy on the sea and in the colonial world.

The French-English phase of the war was in the main a naval combat. The outcome was the practical destruction of the French navy and the firmer establishment of England's sea power. The relations of the two rivals in India and in America were left essentially unchanged,[8] yet England's confirmed mastery of the sea foreshadowed the disastrous issue for France of the next conflict, which was only a little way in the future.

538. **The "Young Pretender"; the Last Rally of the Jacobites** (1745). — Several times during the earlier half of the eighteenth

[8] In India the French had taken Madras from the English, while in America the English had taken Louisburg in Cape Breton from the French. There was a mutual restoration of conquests at the end of the war.

century, the exiled Stuarts attempted to get back the throne they had lost. The last of these attempts was made in 1745, when the "Young Pretender" (grandson of James II), taking advantage of English reverses on the Continent, landed in Scotland, effected a rising of the Scotch Highlanders, worsted the English at Prestonpans, and marched upon London. Forced to retreat into Scotland, he was pursued by the English and defeated at the battle of Culloden Moor, and the Stuart cause was ruined forever.

539. **The Religious Revival; the Rise of Methodism.** — It will be well for us here, midway in the century, to turn aside from the political affairs of England and cast a glance upon the religious life of the time.

In its spiritual and moral life the England of the earlier Hanoverians was the England of the restored Stuarts. The nation was still under the influence of its reaction from the Puritan régime — the hated rule of the "Saints." Among the higher classes there was widespread infidelity; religion was a matter of jest and open scoff. The Church was dead; the higher clergy were neglectful of their duties; sermons were cold and formal essays. The lower classes were stolid, callous, and brutal. Drunkenness was almost universal among high and low. The nation was immersed in material pursuits, and was without thought or care for things ideal and spiritual.

Such a state of things in society as this has never failed to awaken in select souls a vehement protest. And it was so now. At Oxford, about the year 1730, a number of earnest young men, among whom we find John and Charles Wesley and George Whitefield, formed a little society, the object of which was mutual helpfulness in true Christian living. From their strict and methodical manner of life they were derisively nicknamed "Methodists."

This Oxford movement was the starting point of a remarkable religious revival. John Wesley was the organizer, Whitefield the orator, and Charles Wesley the poet of the movement.[9] They and their helpers reached the neglected masses through open-air

[9] Charles Wesley wrote over six thousand hymns, many of which are still favorites in the hymnals of to-day.

meetings. They preached in the fields, at the street corners, beneath the trees, at the great mining camps. The effects of their fervid exhortations were often as startling as were those of the appeals of the preachers of the Crusades.

The leaders of the revival at first had no thought of establishing a Church distinct from the Anglican, but simply aimed at forming within the Established Church a society of earnest, devout workers, somewhat like that of the Christian Endeavor societies in our present churches. Their enthusiasm and their often extravagant manners, however, offended the staid, cold conservatism of the regular clergy, and they were finally constrained by petty persecution to go out from the established organization and form a Church of their own.

FIG. 86.— JOHN WESLEY. (After a painting by *G. Romney*)

The revival, like the Puritan movement of the seventeenth century, left a deep impress upon the life of England. It is due largely to this movement that in true religious feeling, in social purity, in moral earnestness, in humanitarian sentiment,[10] the England of to-day is separated by such a gulf from the England of the first two Georges.

540. **The Seven Years' War** (1756–1763). — Just after the middle of the century there broke out between the French and the English colonists in America the so-called French and Indian

[10] Cf. sec. 543.

War. This struggle became blended with what in Europe is known as the Seven Years' War (sec. 526), and consequently it is from the viewpoint both of Europe and of America that we must regard it.

At first the war went disastrously against the English, — Braddock's expedition against Fort Duquesne, upon the march to which he suffered his memorable defeat in the wilderness, being but one of several ill-starred English undertakings.[11] In the Old World Minorca had been lost, and with it virtually the control of the Mediterranean. Never were Englishmen cast into deeper despair. Never had they so completely lost faith in themselves. The Earl of Chesterfield wrote: "We are undone both at home and abroad. . . . We are no longer a nation."

FIG. 87. — WILLIAM PITT, EARL OF CHATHAM
(After a portrait by *R. Brompton*)

The gloom was at its deepest when the elder William Pitt (later Earl of Chatham), known as "the Great Commoner," came to the head of affairs in England. Pitt was one of the greatest men the English race has ever produced. Frederick the Great expressed his estimate of him in these words: "England has at last brought forth a man." Pitt's estimate of himself was equally high: "I believe that I can

[11] Braddock's defeat occurred in 1755, before the formal declaration of war by either party.

save this country and that no one else can," was the way in which he expressed his belief in his ability to retrieve past misfortunes.

Pitt exercised the full authority of Prime Minister — though he was not the nominal head of the ministry — from 1757 to 1761. These were great years in English history. It was like a return of Cromwell's rule. Pitt's indomitable will and tireless energy pervaded at once every department of the government. "No person," it was said, "ever entered his closet who did not come out of it a braver man." Incompetent men who had received appointments in the army and the navy solely on social grounds or through political influence were replaced by men of capacity, men upon whom Pitt could rely to carry out his plans.

The war against France was pushed not only in America and upon the sea, but also in India and upon the Continent. Many disapproved of Pitt's policy of fighting France by aiding Frederick, but this opposition to his measures only called out Pitt's memorable declaration that he would conquer America in Germany.

The turning point in the war, so far as America was concerned, was the great victory gained by the English under the youthful Major General Wolfe over the French under Montcalm on the Heights of Quebec (1759). The victory gave England Quebec, the key to the situation in the New World.

In India also victory was declaring for the English in their struggle there with the French and their native allies.[12] Two years before the battle of Quebec, Colonel Robert Clive, an officer in the employ of the English East India Company, with eleven hundred English soldiers and two thousand sepoys,[13] in the memorable battle of Plassey (1757) had put to flight a native army of sixty thousand foot and horse, and had thus virtually laid, in the northeastern region of the peninsula, the basis of England's great Indian Empire.[14]

[12] The situation here was somewhat similar to that in the New World. Both the French and the English had been long on the ground, but merely as traders, and not as builders of empires. About the middle of the eighteenth century, however, they began to conquer the country and to lay the foundations of territorial dominion.

[13] The name given native soldiers in European employ.

[14] The prelude to this battle was a terrible crime committed by Siraj-ud-Daula, viceroy of Bengal and other provinces. Moved by anger at the refusal of the English

The end came in 1763 with the Peace of Paris. France ceded to England Canada and all her possessions in North America east of the Mississippi River, save New Orleans and a little adjoining land (which, along with the French territory west of the Mississippi, had already been given to Spain), and two little islands in the neighborhood of Newfoundland, which she was allowed to retain to dry fish on. She also withdrew from India as a political rival of England.[15] England's supremacy in the colonial world and her mastery of the sea were now firmly established. This position, notwithstanding severe losses of which we shall speak immediately, she has maintained up to the present day.

541. **The American Revolution** (1775–1783). — The French and Indian War was the prelude to the War of American Independence. The overthrow of the French power in America made the English colonists less dependent than hitherto upon the mother country, since this removed their only dangerous rival and enemy on the continent. Clear-sighted statesmen had predicted that when the colonists no longer needed England's help against the French they would sever the bonds uniting them to the home land, if at any time these bonds chafed them.

And very soon the bonds did chafe. A majority in Parliament, thinking that the colonists should help pay the expenses of colonial defense, insisted upon taxing them. The colonists maintained that they could be justly taxed only through their own legislative assemblies. The British government refusing to acknowledge this principle, the colonists took up arms in defense of those rights and liberties which their fathers had won with so hard a struggle from English kings on English soil.

official to surrender certain fugitives, and urged on by French agents, the viceroy attacked the English fort and factory at Calcutta, and having secured one hundred and forty-six prisoners, thrust them into a contracted guardroom which was provided with only two small grated windows, — what in the story of India is known as "the Black Hole of Calcutta." During the course of a sultry night all but twenty-three of the unfortunate prisoners died of suffocation. It was in response to the cry which arose for vengeance that Robert Clive was sent by the English officials at Madras to succor Bengal.

15 Pondicherry, a French trading post on the eastern coast of India, was restored to France, and she still remained in the peninsula as a trader; but her political power was as completely broken there by the war as in America.

France seized the opportunity presented by the war to avenge herself upon England for the loss of Canada,[16] and gave aid to the colonists. Spain and Holland also were both drawn into the struggle, fighting against their old-time rival and foe.

The war was ended by the Peace of Paris (1783). England acknowledged the independence of the thirteen colonies, — and a Greater England began its separate career in the New World. At the same time England was constrained to restore or to cede various islands and territories to France and to Spain. The magnificent empire with which she had emerged from the Seven Years' War seemed shattered and ruined beyond recovery. Not only England's enemies but many Englishmen themselves believed that her days of imperial rule were ended.

But there were yet left to England Canada and India; and only recently Australia had come into her possession (sec. 734). And then England was yet mistress of the seas; her commercial supremacy remained unshaken. There were elements here which might become factors of a new empire greater than the one which had been lost. But no Englishman standing in the gloom of the year 1783 could look far enough into the future to foresee the greatness and splendor of England's second empire which was to rise out of the ruins of the first.

542. **Legislative Independence of Ireland** (1782). — While the War of American Independence was going on, the Irish, taking advantage of the embarrassment of the English government, demanded legislative independence. Since the Norman period Ireland had had a Parliament of her own, but it was dependent upon the English crown, and at this time was subordinate to the English Parliament, which asserted and exercised the right to bind Ireland by its laws. This the Anglo-Irish patriots strenuously resisted and drew up a Declaration of Rights wherein they demanded the legislative independence of Ireland. Fear of a revolt led England to grant the demands of the patriots and acknowledge the independence of the Irish Parliament (1782).

[16] There were other and more admirable motives animating many of the individual Frenchmen who, like Lafayette, fought on the side of the American patriots (sec. 560).

543. **The Abolition of the Slave Trade.** — Intimately connected with the great religious revival led by the Wesleys and Whitefield were certain philanthropic movements which hold a prominent place in the history of the moral and social life not only of England but of humanity. The most noteworthy of these was that resulting in the abolition of the African slave trade.

We have noticed how at the opening of the eighteenth century England secured from Spain the contract for providing her American colonies with negro slaves (sec. 531). There was then little or no moral disapproval of this iniquitous traffic. But one effect of the religious revival was the calling into existence of much genuine philanthropic feeling. This sentiment expressed itself in a movement for the abolition of the inhuman trade.

The leaders of the movement were Thomas Clarkson (1760–1846) and William Wilberforce (1759–1833). The terrible disclosures which were made of the atrocious cruelty of the slave dealers stirred the public indignation and awakened the national conscience. Finally, in 1807, after twenty years of agitation, a law was passed abolishing the trade.[17] This signaled as great a moral victory as ever was won in the English Parliament, for it was the aroused moral sentiment of the nation which was the main force that carried the reform measure through the Houses.[18]

544. **The Industrial Revolution.** — We turn now from the political, religious, and moral realms to the industrial domain. In this sphere of English life the latter part of the eighteenth century witnessed a wonderful revolution. It was England's commercial supremacy which had prepared the way for the great industrial development. The outward movement had created a world-wide market for English goods. She had become "the

[17] England had been anticipated by Denmark in the condemnation of the slave trade. That country had abolished the traffic in 1802. In the United States the importation of slaves was illegal after 1808. Before 1820 most civilized states had placed the trade under the ban.

[18] Another important humanitarian movement of the century was that of prison reform. This was effected chiefly through the labors of a single person, the philanthropist John Howard (1726–1790), who devoted his life to effecting a reform in prison conditions and discipline.

workshop of the world." Naturally manufactures were encouraged, and inventive genius and ingenuity stimulated to the utmost in devising improved processes in the industrial arts. The result was an industrial revolution such as the centuries known to history had never witnessed before.

In order that we may get the right point of view here and be able to appreciate the importance of the industrial revolution of which we speak, it is necessary that we should first note the remarkable fact that while civilization during historic times had made great advances on many lines and in many domains, in the industrial realm it had remained almost stationary from the dawn of history. At the middle of the eighteenth century all the industrial arts were being carried on in practically the same way that they were followed six or seven thousand years before in ancient Egypt and Babylonia.

Suddenly all this was changed by a few inventions. About 1767 Hargreaves invented the spinning jenny. From the beginning of history, indeed from a period lost in the obscurity of prehistoric times, all the thread used in weaving had been made by twisting each thread separately. The spinning jenny, when perfected,[19] with a single attendant twisted hundreds of threads at once. Within twenty years from the time of this invention there were between four and five million spindles in use in England.

It was now possible to produce thread in unlimited quantities. The next thing needed was improved machinery for weaving it into cloth. This was soon provided by Cartwright's power loom (1785). The next requisite was motive power to run the new machinery. At just this time James Watt brought out his invention, or rather improvement, of the steam engine (1785). In its ruder form it had been used in the mines; now it was introduced into the factories.

The primary forces of the great industrial revolution — the spinning jenny, the power loom, and the steam engine — were now at work. The application of the steam engine to transportation purposes gave the world the steam railroad and the steamship.

[19] It was perfected by Arkwright and Crompton by 1779.

These inventions and discoveries in the industrial realm mark an epoch in the history of civilization. We have to go back to prehistoric times to find in this domain any inventions or discoveries like them in their import for human progress. There is nothing between Menes in Egypt and George III in England with which to compare them. The discovery of fire, the invention of metal tools, and the domestication of animals and plants,[20] — these inventions and achievements of prehistoric man are alone worthy, in their transforming effect upon human society, of being placed alongside them.

545. **Import to England of the Industrial Revolution.** — In the present connection we can note the bearing of the great industrial revolution upon only one episode in the general historical movement. It exerted a determining influence upon the course and issue of the great French Revolution and of the Napoleonic Wars which grew out of it. It armed England for the great fight, and enabled her to play the important part she did in that period of titanic struggle. "It is our improved steam engine," says Lord Jeffrey in his eulogy of Watt (written in 1819), "which has fought the battles of Europe and exalted and sustained through the late tremendous contest the political greatness of our land." It was the steam engine which created the wealth which England used so lavishly in carrying on the fight against Napoleon, and which did more perhaps than any other force in giving direction to the course of events during the years of his domination.

546. **Conclusion.** — With the French Revolution we reach a period in which English history must be regarded from the viewpoint of France. Indeed, for the space of half a generation after the rise of Napoleon to power, all European history becomes largely biographical and centers about that unique personality. Consequently we shall drop the story of English history at this point and let it blend with the story of the Revolution and that of the Napoleonic Empire.

All that we need here notice is that the Napoleonic Wars, in their Anglo-French phase, were essentially a continuation — and

[20] See *Ancient History*, secs. 8–10.

the end — of the second Hundred Years' War between England and France. Napoleon, having seized supreme power in France, endeavored to destroy England's commercial supremacy and to regain for France that position in the colonial world from which she had been thrust by England. But this tremendous struggle, like all the others in which England had engaged with her ancient foe, — save the one in which she lost her American colonies, — only resulted, as we shall see later, in bringing into her hands additional colonial possessions, and in placing her naval power and commercial supremacy on a firmer basis than ever before.

Selections from the Sources. — HENDERSON, *Side Lights on English History*, pp. 214–283; KENDALL, *Source-Book*, chaps. xvi–xviii, particularly Extract No. 111, "A View of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century," by Swift; ADAMS and STEPHENS, *Select Documents of English Constitutional History*, pp. 475–506; and HILL, *Liberty Documents*, chaps. xi and xii. For the slave trade, see CLARKSON, *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the Slave Trade by the British Parliament.* Clarkson was himself a main instrument in bringing about the great reform.

Secondary Works. — For the most suggestive short work on the period turn to SEELEY, *The Expansion of England.* Written on somewhat similar lines is CALDECOTT, *English Colonization and Empire*, chaps. iii–v. LECKY, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, is the best comprehensive work. MORRIS, *The Age of Queen Anne.* For the naval history of the period, see MAHAN, *The Influence of Sea Power upon History*, chaps. v–xiv.

Biographies: MORLEY, *Walpole;* SOUTHEY, *Life of Wesley;* GREEN, *William Pitt, Earl of Chatham;* MACAULAY, *Essays* on Horace Walpole, the Earl of Chatham (two essays), Lord Clive, and Warren Hastings.

For the growth of the English Cabinet: BLAUVELT, *The Development of Cabinet Government in England;* and JENKS, *Parliamentary England.* For the rise of Methodism: OVERTON, *The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century.* For the French and English in America: FISKE, *New England and New France*, chaps. vii–x; and PARKMAN, *Montcalm and Wolfe.* For the conflict between England and her American colonies: LECKY, *The American Revolution* (ed. by James Albert Woodburn). For the English in India: LYALL, *The Rise of the British Dominion in India.* For industrial and Social England: CHEYNEY, *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England*, chap. viii.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The "Assiento" and the slave trade in the seventeenth century. 2. The Scotch project of a Panama colony. 3. The English Cabinet. 4. The South Sea Bubble. 5. John Wesley. 6. The abolition of the slave trade. 7. John Howard and prison reform.

CHAPTER XXXII

AUSTRIA UNDER THE BENEVOLENT DESPOT, EMPEROR JOSEPH II (1780–1790)

547. **Emperor Joseph II's Ideal and Aim.** — Most worthy of remembrance among the royal contemporaries of Frederick the Great was Emperor Joseph II, the son of the Empress-Queen Maria Theresa. He became Emperor in 1765, and upon the death of his mother in 1780 succeeded to the sovereignty of the Austrian dominions. He was the best, though not the greatest, of the enlightened despots.

Joseph II's aim was to make of the Austrian dominions an ideal state. This, in his conception, was a state possessing geographical and moral unity; that is to say, a state with well-rounded scientific frontiers, with all power concentrated in the hands of the sovereign, with all its provinces ruled alike, and with all its inhabitants using the same language and having the same ideas, customs, and aspirations.

548. **His Reforms.** — Now the Austrian monarchy was, and still is, just the opposite of all this. Joseph's endeavor was to make it like France, compact geographically, and homogeneous in language and customs. He wiped out many of the old divisions based on race, language, and historical antecedents, and in the interest of uniformity and simplicity of administration divided a great part of the monarchy into thirteen provinces, and each of these again into smaller subdivisions called circles. He abolished serfdom in several of his states. He closed over two thousand monasteries and devoted their property to the establishment of colleges, hospitals, and other public institutions. He issued a celebrated Edict of Toleration (1781), giving to all Christian sects equality of rights and privileges. He provided the cities of his

dominions with schools in which all the pupils were taught exactly the same lessons in exactly the same way. He founded libraries and encouraged research. He softened the harsh punishments of the mediæval criminal code, and made the laws to conform to reason. He fostered manufactures, and by his own laborious life — he is said to have worked more hours each day than any other man in his dominions — set an example of industry to his subjects.

549. His Dealings with the Low Countries and with Hungary. — In the furtherance of his plans, Joseph attempted to reduce the Low Countries, which constituted almost an independent state loosely united to Austria, to the condition of an administrative province of the Austrian monarchy. He disregarded the constitution, laws, and customs of the provinces, interfered with the religion of the people, and substituted for the existing system of education a new system conforming to his own ideas of what should be taught the youth. Angered by all this meddling with their affairs, the Netherlanders rose in open revolt and declared themselves independent of the Austrian crown (1790).

At the same time Joseph drove his Hungarian subjects to the verge of rebellion by attempting to deal with Hungary in some such arbitrary way as he had dealt with the Netherlands, — in a word, to Germanize the country. The situation became so threatening that Joseph, upon his dying bed, was constrained to annul all his reform measures and put everything back as it was, save as regards the serfs, who retained the freedom with which he had dowered them.

550. Causes of the Failure of Joseph II's Attempted Reforms. — The Emperor Joseph II is one of the most pathetic figures in history. He died in 1790, a weary, heartbroken man, lamenting that though he had labored his life through to make his subjects contented and happy and to deserve their love, he had simply filled his empire with unrest and unhappiness, and instead of winning the gratitude of his subjects had awakened only their ingratitude.

The most of Joseph's attempted reforms, save those of the abolition of serfdom and the revision of the laws, had in truth

CENTRAL EUROPE
1780
L.L.POATES, ENGR., N.Y.
German Empire
Austrian
Prussian
England and Hanover
Danish
Swedish
French
Savoyard
NORTH SEA
ENGLAND
IRELAND
WALES
London
Amsterdam
DENMARK
Copenhagen
SWEDEN
BORNHOLM
Königsberg
Danzig
RÜGEN
R. Elder
SCHLESWICK
HOLSTEIN
MECKLENBURG
POMERANIA
WEST PRUSSIA
EAST PRUSSIA
Thorn
R. Vistula
Warsaw
POLAND
Hamburg
R. Elbe
Bremen
Hanover
HANOVER
BRANDENBURG
Berlin
NETHERLANDS
SAXONY
Dresden
Breslau
Brussels
AUSTRIAN NETHERLANDS
GERMAN EMPIRE
English Channel
Prague
BOHEMIA
Cracow
GALICIA
Metz
Paris
R. Seine
Strasbourg
BADEN
WURTEMBERG
BAVARIA
AUSTRIA
R. Danube
Vienna
Pesth
HUNGARY
R. Loire
BAY OF BISCAY
FRANCE
Besançon
SWISS CONFEDERATION
Bern
Geneva
R. Drave
SAVOY
Turin
Milan
VENETIAN DOMINIONS
Venice
R. Rhone
R. Po
R. Garonne
Orange
Avignon
Genoa
Florence
TUSCANY
STATES OF THE CHURCH
ADRIATIC SEA
MONTENEGRO
SPAIN
Andorra
CORSICA
Rome
SARDINIA

resulted in dismal failures. This was not because what he aimed to do was not in sad need of being done, but because in such matters the good intention is not sufficient without patience and wisdom. Joseph had neither. His lack of patience to wait for results is well shown in his method of creating a park: at great expense he set out full-grown trees instead of saplings.

And Joseph lacked that wisdom which recognizes that the reformer must take account of the beliefs, habits, and prejudices of men and of races. As his biographer Paganel comments, "It is only in the hands of God that man is as clay."

551. Reform from above versus Reform from below. — Joseph II was one of the last of the benevolent despots. Europe owes much to them. Some of their reforms were permanent and effected great amelioration in the condition of the people in several of the countries of the Continent. But the enlightened despots were hampered in their work through being despots. Their theory of government shut out the people from all participation in the work of reform. But all true reform must proceed from below and not from above. As Buckle in his *History of Civilization in England* writes, "No reform can produce real good unless it is the work of public opinion, and unless the people themselves take the initiative." Nor should reforms inaugurated be dependent upon a single life. This was a fatal weakness in the movement of reform by the kings themselves. When a benevolent despot died, too often his work ended with his life.

The year preceding the death of Joseph II the French Revolution had begun. The people as well as their kings had been studying the philosophers and the political economists, and they were now themselves to assume the rôle of reformers. We shall see with what success they met in their new part.

Secondary Works. — BRIGHT, *Joseph II*, is the best short biography of the Emperor in English. COXE, *History of the House of Austria*, vol. iii, chaps. cxxiv–cxxxi. HASSALL, *The Balance of Power, 1715–1789*, chap. xiii. STEPHENS, *Syllabus of Lectures on Modern European History*, Lect. xlvii, gives a helpful summary of Emperor Joseph's policies and reforms.

II. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE NAPOLEONIC ERA

(1789–1815)

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION (1789–1799)

I. Causes of the Revolution; the States-General of 1789

552. Introductory. — The French Revolution, in its deepest impulses, was a continuation of the Renaissance and the Reformation. It was the spirit of the intellectual revival and the religious reform at work in the political and the social realm. It was the revolt of the French people against royal despotism and class privilege. "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" was the motto of the Revolution. In the name of these principles great crimes were indeed committed; but these excesses of the Revolution are not to be confounded with its true spirit and aims. The French people in 1789 contended for substantially the same principles that the English people defended in 1642 and 1688, and that the American colonists maintained in 1776. It is only as we view them in this light that we can feel a sympathetic interest in the men and events of this tumultuous period of French history.

553. Causes of the Revolution. — Chief among the causes of the French Revolution were the abuses and extravagances of the Bourbon monarchy, the unjust privileges enjoyed by the nobility and the higher clergy, the wretched condition of the poorer classes of the people, and the revolutionary character and spirit of French philosophy and literature. To these must be added, as

a proximate cause, the influence of the American Revolution. We will speak briefly of these several matters.

Even the hastiest examination of the condition of France during the century preceding the tremendous social upheaval will enable us to understand how an English statesman,[1] writing a generation before the bursting of the storm, could say, "All the symptoms which I have ever met with in history, previous to great changes and revolutions in government, now exist and daily increase in France."

554. **The Bourbon Monarchy.** — We simply repeat what we have already learned when we say that the authority of the French crown under the Bourbons had become unbearably despotic and oppressive. The life and property of every person in France were at the arbitrary disposal of the king. Persons were thrown into prison without even knowing the offense for which they were arrested. *Lettres de cachet*, or sealed warrants for arrest, were even signed by the king in blank and given to his favorites to use against their personal enemies.

The taxes were imposed by the authority of the king alone. They struck the poor rather than the rich, and, in consequence of a miserable and corrupt system of collection, not more than one half or two thirds of the money wrung from the taxpayers ever reached the royal treasury. The public money thus gathered was squandered in maintaining a court the scandalous extravagances and debaucheries of which would shame a Turkish sultan.

Meanwhile all public works and all national interests, after the reign of Louis XIV, were utterly neglected. Louis XV, it is asserted, "probably spent more money on his harem than on any department of state." Louis XVI was sincerely desirous of reform. So far as good intentions go, he deserves a place among the best of the benevolent despots. But unfortunately he did not possess the qualities essential in a reformer; he was weak and irresolute. Besides, it was too late. Matters had gone too far. France was already caught in the rapids that sweep down to the abyss of revolution.

[1] Lord Chesterfield, writing in 1753.

555. **The Nobility.** — The French nobility on the eve of the Revolution numbered probably between twenty and thirty thousand families, comprising about a hundred or a hundred and fifty thousand persons. Although owning one fifth of the soil of France and exercising feudal rights over much of the land belonging to peasant proprietors, still these nobles paid scarcely any taxes.

The higher nobility were chiefly the pensioners of the king, the ornaments of his court, living in riotous luxury at Paris and Versailles. Stripped of their ancient power, they still retained all the old pride and arrogance of their order, and clung tenaciously to all their feudal privileges and exemptions. The rents of their estates, with which they supplemented the bounty of the king, were wrung from their wretched tenants with pitiless severity. That absentee landlordism which has created such poverty in Ireland and engendered such bitterness in the hearts of the Irish peasants towards their English landlords will serve to illustrate in some measure the relation of the French nobles to their tenants at the time of which we are speaking.

556. **The Higher Clergy.** — The upper clergy formed a decayed feudal hierarchy. A third of the lands of France was in their hands, and this immense property was almost wholly exempt from taxation. The bishops and abbots were usually drawn from the ranks of the nobility, being attracted to the service of the Church rather by its enormous revenues and the social distinction conferred by its offices than by the inducements of piety. They owed their position to royal appointment, and commonly spent their princely incomes in luxurious life at court.

The relation of these "patrician prelates" to the people and to the humbler clergy should be carefully noted, otherwise certain important phases of the Revolution will not be understood. Though there were noble exceptions, the most of these dignitaries were narrow-minded and self-seeking, and many of them so shamelessly immoral that as a class they had lost all credit and authority with the people whose shepherds they ostensibly were. And not only had they discredited themselves, but they had brought the Church and even Christianity itself into disrepute. The hatred

the people felt towards them was transferred to the religion which they so unworthily represented.

The lower clergy, made up in the main of humble parish priests, were drawn largely from the peasant class, and shared their poverty. Their salaries were mere pittances compared with the princely incomes enjoyed by the bishops and abbots. Their exemplary lives and their faithfulness in the performance of the duties of their sacred calling presented a reproving contrast to the debaucheries and infidelities of their ecclesiastical superiors. They were naturally in sympathy with the lower classes to which by birth they belonged, and shared their feelings of dislike towards the great prelates on account of their selfish pride and odious arrogance.

557. **The Commons, or Third Estate.** — Below the two privileged orders stood the nonprivileged commons, known as the *Tiers État*, or Third Estate. This class embraced all the nation aside from the nobility and the clergy, — that is to say, the great bulk of the population. It numbered probably about twenty-five million souls. The order was divided into two chief classes, namely, the *bourgeoisie*, or middle class, and the peasantry.

The middle class, which was comparatively small in numbers, was made up of the well-to-do and wealthy merchants, traders, lawyers, and other professional men. It constituted the most intelligent portion of the French nation. It was from this class that came most of the leaders of the revolutionary movement during its earlier stages.

The peasants constituted the majority of the Third Estate. The condition of most of them could hardly have been worse. Their only recognized use in the state was "to pay feudal services to the lords,[2] tithes to the priests, and imposts to the king." Especially vexatious were the old feudal regulations to which they were subjected in the cultivation of the soil. Thus they were forbidden to fence their fields for the protection of their crops, as

[2] Though practically all the French peasantry had long since been emancipated from the personal servitude of mediæval serfdom, still the majority of them owed to some lord feudal dues for the land they tilled, and were bound to pay tolls at his mill, oven, and wine press. See sec. 95.

the fences interfered with the lord's progress in the hunt; they were not allowed to frighten away the game which fed upon their vegetables; and they were even prohibited from cultivating their fields at certain seasons, as this disturbed the nesting partridges.

Being kept in a state of abject poverty, a failure of their crops reduced the French tenants to absolute starvation. It was not an unusual thing to find women and children dead in the woods or along the roadways. The words addressed by Fénelon to Louis XIV in 1693 might with almost equal truth have been addressed to Louis XVI: "Your people are dying of hunger," he said; "instead of money being wrenched from these poor creatures, clothes and food should be given them. France is simply a large hospital, full of woe and empty of food."

Another who saw all this misery thus pictures the appearance of the peasantry: "One sees certain fierce animals, male and female, scattered through the fields; they are black, livid, and burned by the sun, and attached to the soil, which they dig up and stir with indomitable industry; they have what is like an articulate voice, and when they rise up on their feet they show a human face, — in truth they are human beings. They retire at night into dens, where they live on black bread and water and roots; they save other men the trouble of sowing and delving and harvesting, and hence deserve not to lack of this bread which they have sown." [8]

It is true that during the eighteenth century the condition of perhaps the majority of the French peasants had been much improved, and that on the eve of the Revolution their state was much more tolerable than that of the peasantry in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. The number of peasant proprietors had become large and was steadily increasing, and in many districts at least was greater than at any earlier period. Yet never had a more rebellious spirit stirred in the French peasantry than at just this time. And the reason of this was not because the system under which they lived was "more severe, but more odious" than ever before, — more odious because the peasant of

[8] La Bruyère, *Les Caractères*, "De l'Homme," § cxxviii.

1789, being more intelligent, realized more keenly the wrongs he suffered, and knew better his rights as a man than did the ignorant, stolid peasant of the previous century. So true is it, as Hegel affirms, that Revolution is impossible without Renaissance.[4]

558. **The Revolutionary Spirit of French Philosophy; Representative Authors.** — French philosophy in the eighteenth century was bold, skeptical, and revolutionary. Its dominant note was one of passionate protest against the inequalities of the existing system of society and government. The great writers — Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and D'Alembert — represent its prevailing spirit and tendency.[5]

Montesquieu (1689–1755) was a great admirer of English institutions. He had passed almost two years of his early life in England and had thus become imbued with English ideas and English love of constitutional government. His most important work was entitled *The Spirit of Laws*, a work which had a remarkable influence upon the enlightened despots of the latter part of the eighteenth century.

Voltaire (1694–1778) was the very impersonation of the tendencies of his age. He gave expression, forcible and striking, to what the people were vaguely thinking and feeling. In the use of satire and irony he never had a superior, if a peer. He has

[4] The truth of this law underlying the historical development is shown in the antecedents of the English Revolution of the seventeenth century and of the American Revolution of the eighteenth. In neither case was it the actual burdens imposed by despotic authority which provoked rebellion. The real cause of revolt in each case was that general intelligence of the people which made even the slightest infringement of rights seem intolerable. Compare sec. 725.

[5] The fountain head of this freedom-loving and skeptical philosophy was in England. From the death of Louis XIV on to the commencement of the Revolution, England was a sort of Mecca for the literary and philosophical French world. Speaking of the results of this worship of the men of France at the English shrine, Buckle writes as follows: "Their determination to search for liberty in the place where alone it could be found, gave rise to that junction of the French and English intellects which, looking at the immense chain of its effects, is by far the most important fact in the history of the eighteenth century" (*History of Civilization in England*, vol. i, chap. xii). Prominent among the English scientists and writers who most deeply influenced French science and philosophy were Sir Isaac Newton (1642–1727), John Locke (1632–1704), Lord Shaftesbury (1671–1713), and Lord Bolingbroke (1678–1751). Much of Voltaire's work was largely a popularization of the science of Newton and the philosophy of Locke.

been well called "the magician of the art of writing." He had a most marvelous faculty of condensing thought; putting whole philosophies in an epigram, he supplied the French people with proverbs for a century. He loved justice, in Carlyle's phrase, as it should be loved. His aim was to do away with injustice, prejudices, and superstitions, and to make justice and reason dominant in human affairs. He disbelieved in revealed religion;[6] he would have men follow simply their inner sense of what is right and reasonable. His influence upon Frederick the Great of Prussia and upon other reforming kings and ministers was very great. In truth his writings stirred all Europe as well as all France, and did so much to prepare the minds and hearts of men for the Revolution and to determine its course that in one sense there was much truth in his declaration, "I have accomplished more in my day than either Luther or Calvin."



FIG. 88. — VOLTAIRE. (From a statue by *Houdon*)

Rousseau (1712–1778), like Voltaire, had neither faith nor hope in existing institutions. Society and government seemed to him contrivances designed by the strong for the enslavement of the weak: "Man was born free and is everywhere in chains" is the burden of his complaint. Consequently he would do away with all these things. He would have men give up their artificial, complex life in society and return to the simplicity of what he called "a state of nature." He idealized the life of savages, and declared that untutored tribes were happier than civilized men. He drew such an idyllic picture of the life of man in a state of nature that Voltaire, after reading his treatise thereon, wrote him that it filled him with a longing to go on all fours.

[6] By some of Voltaire's disciples his doctrines were developed into atheism; but Voltaire himself was a deist, combating alike atheism and Christianity.

Rousseau's greatest work was entitled *The Social Contract.* The state, according to him, is a voluntary association or brotherhood of equals. From this followed the sovereignty of the people and the abolition of inequality and class oppression. The writings of Rousseau had an extraordinary influence upon liberal-minded and generous souls everywhere. The framers of the American Declaration of Rights drew from his works many of their ideas and even phrases. The aid which France extended to the American colonists, in so far as that aid was prompted by a generous enthusiasm for republican ideals, was a direct outcome of the teachings of Rousseau. The idealists and dreamers of the French Revolution were wholly under the spell cast upon the world by the "New Gospel of Humanity" preached so fervently by the author of *The Social Contract.*

Diderot (1713–1784) and D'Alembert (1717–1783) were the chief of the so-called Encyclopedists, the compilers of an immense work in twenty-eight volumes. The purpose of this prodigious compilation was to gather up and systematize all the facts in science and history in possession of the world, in order that this knowledge might be made the basis of a philosophy of life and of the universe which should supersede all the old systems of thought and belief resting simply on authority.

559. **The Effects of this Philosophy.** — The tendency and effect of this skeptical philosophy was to create hatred and contempt for the institutions of both State and Church, and to foster discontent with the established order of things.

Nor was it difficult for the theoretical revolutionists to secure the ear of a people proverbially impulsive and imaginative, and suffering to the point of desperation from the unequal and oppressive arrangements of a wholly artificial society. The grand ideas of the proposed crusade for the recovery of the rights of man could not fail of appealing powerfully to that imaginative genius of the French people which had led them to be foremost in the romantic expeditions for the recovery of the Holy Sepulcher.

This daring, skeptical, revolutionary philosophy, having once taken possession of the minds of the French people, was bound,

sooner or later, to find expression in their acts. "Human thought," says Lamartine, "is like the Divine Mind: it makes everything in its own image." We shall soon see this philosophy making history, and making it like unto itself.[7]

560. **Influence of the American Revolution.** — Not one of the least potent of the proximate causes of the French Revolution was the successful establishment of the American republic. "The American Revolution has laid the foundation of another in France, if the government does not take care of itself," wrote Arthur Young just on the eve of the outbreak in France. "Without the successful termination of the American War of Independence," writes Professor H. Morse Stephens, "it may be doubted whether the French Revolution would have developed as it did, or whether it would have taken place at all."

The French people sympathized deeply with the English colonists in their struggle for independence. Many of the nobility, like Lafayette, — for the French nobles, strangely blind to the logical consequences of the new philosophy, were very many of them its enthusiastic disciples, — offered to the patriots the service of their swords; and the popular feeling, combined with a revengeful wish to see the British Empire dismembered, finally led the French government to extend to them openly the aid of the armies of France.

The final triumph of the cause of liberty awakened scarcely less enthusiasm and rejoicing in France than in America. The republican simplicity of the newborn state, contrasting so strongly with the extravagance and artificiality of the court at Versailles, elicited the unbounded admiration of the French people. In this young republic of the Western world they saw realized the Arcadia of their philosophy.[8] It was no longer a dream. They themselves had helped to make it real. Here the rights of man had been

[7] The teachings of the eighteenth-century French political economists were in spirit and tendency like the doctrines promulgated by the French thinkers and writers in other fields. The most noted of these economists were Quesnay (1694–1774), Vincent de Gournay (1712–1759), and Turgot (1727–1781).

[8] For a fine illustration of this, see Trevelyan's *American Revolution*, Part I, pp. 52, 53.

recovered and vindicated. And now this liberty which the French people had helped the American colonists to secure, they were impatient to see France herself enjoy.

561. End of the Reign of Louis XV; "After us the Deluge." — The long-gathering tempest is now ready to break over France. Louis XV died in 1774. In the early part of his reign his subjects had affectionately called him "the Well-Beloved," but long before he laid down his scepter all their early love and admiration had been turned into hatred and contempt. Besides being overbearing and despotic, the king was indolent and scandalously profligate. During twenty years of his reign, as we have already learned, he was wholly under the influence of the notorious Madame de Pompadour (sec. 457).

The inevitable issue of this orgy of folly and extravagance seems to have been clearly enough perceived by the chief actors in it, as is shown by that reckless phrase attributed to the king and his favorite, — "After us the Deluge." And after them the deluge indeed did come. The near thunders of the approaching tempest could already be heard when Louis XV lay down to die.

562. The Accession of Louis XVI (1774); Financial Troubles; the Meeting of the Notables (1787). — Louis XV left the tottering throne to his grandson, Louis XVI, then only twenty years of age. He had recently been married to the beautiful and light-hearted Archduchess Marie Antoinette of Austria. The first act of the young couple, upon learning that the burdens of sovereignty had descended upon their shoulders, was, it was rumored, to cast themselves upon their knees with the prayer, "O God! guide and protect us; we are too young to govern!" Well indeed might they appeal to Heaven; there was no earthly help.

How to raise money was the urgent and anxious question with the government. France was on the verge of bankruptcy. The king called to his side successively Turgot, Necker, and other eminent statesmen as his ministers of finance; but their policies and remedies availed little or nothing. The traditions of the court, the rigidity of long-established customs, and the heartless selfishness of the privileged classes rendered reform in taxation

and efficient retrenchment impossible. The national debt grew constantly larger. The people charged all to the extravagance of the queen, whom they called "Madame Deficit."

In 1787 the king summoned the Notables, a body composed chiefly of great lords and prelates, who had not been called to advise with the king since the year 1626. But miserable counselors were they all. Refusing to give up any of their feudal privileges, or to tax the property of their own orders that the enormous public burdens which were crushing the commons might be lightened, their coming together resulted in nothing.

563. **The Calling of the States-General; the Elections; the Cahiers.** — As a last resort it was resolved to summon the united wisdom of the nation, to call together the States-General, the almost-forgotten national assembly, composed of representatives of the three estates, — the nobility, the clergy, and the commons.

In December, 1788, the king by proclamation called upon the French people to elect deputies to this body, which had not met to deliberate upon the affairs of France for a period of one hundred and seventy-five years. Divine-right royalty had seen no necessity hitherto of seeking counsel of the people. The summoning of the ancient assembly was an acknowledgment that absolute monarchy had failed in France. How complete and irremediable that failure was, was recognized by no one as yet.

In connection with the elections there had been made by the king's advisers a momentous decision, one which practically involved the fate of the monarchy. The commons, conscious that they formed the overwhelming majority of the nation, insisted upon being allowed double representation, that is, as many deputies as both the other orders. The minister, Necker, yielded to this demand. They were authorized to send up six hundred deputies, while the nobility and the clergy were each to have only three hundred representatives.

The electors had been instructed to draw up statements of grievances and suggestions of reform for the information and guidance of the States-General. Very many of these documents, which are known as *cahiers*, were substantially copies of models

drawn up by lawyers and others and widely distributed; nevertheless they form a valuable record of the France of 1789, — of the grievances of the people, of their ideas of reform, and of their aspirations. One demand common to them all is that the nation through its representatives shall have part in the government. Those of the Third Estate call for the abolition of feudal rents and services, and for the equalization among the orders of the burdens of taxation. In a word, they were petitions for equality and justice.

564. **The States-General changed into the National Assembly.** — On the fifth of May, 1789, a memorable date, the deputies to the States-General met at Versailles. Thither the eyes of the nation were now turned in hope and expectancy. Surely if the redemption of France could be worked out by human wisdom, it would now be effected.

At the very outset a dispute arose between the privileged orders and the commons respecting the manner of voting. It had been the ancient custom of the body for each order to deliberate in its own hall, and for the vote upon all questions to be by orders.[9] But the commons now demanded that this old custom should be ignored, and that the voting should be by individuals; for should the vote be taken by orders, then their double representation would be a mere mockery, and the clergy and nobility by combining could always outvote them. For five weeks the quarrel kept everything in a deadlock.

Finally, the commons, emboldened by the tone of public opinion without, took a decisive, revolutionary step. They declared themselves the National Assembly, and then invited the other two orders to join them in their deliberations, giving them to understand that if they did not choose to do so they should proceed to the consideration of public affairs without them.

King, nobles, and prelates were alarmed at the bold attitude assumed by the commons. The king, in helpless alarm, suspended

[9] That is to say, the majority of the representatives of each order decided the vote for that order, and then two of these majority votes registered the decision of the whole body of deputies.

the sitting of the rebellious deputies and guarded the door of their hall. But the commons, gathering in the tennis court, a great barnlike building without seats, bound themselves by oath not to separate until they had framed a constitution for France. This act was very much like that of the members of the Long Parliament, who practically opened the English Revolution by resolving that they should not be dissolved without their own consent (sec. 467).

Shut out from the tennis court, the representatives of the Third Estate met in one of the churches of Versailles. Here they were joined by two of the nobility and a large number of the deputies of the clergy. It looked as though the three orders would soon coalesce. The court party labored to prevent this. A royal sitting, or joint meeting of the three estates, was held. The king, influenced by his advisers, read a speech in which, assuming the tone of an English Stuart, he admonished the commons not to attack the privileges of the other orders, and then commanded the deputies of the three orders to retire to their separate halls. The clergy and the nobility obeyed. The commons kept their seats.

At this juncture the master of ceremonies somewhat pertly said to them, "You heard the king's command?" Thereupon Mirabeau, one of the leaders of the commons, a man of "Jupiter-like" mien and tone, turned upon the messenger with these memorable words: "Go, tell those who sent you that we are here by the command of the people, and here we shall stay until driven out at the point of the bayonet." The poor official was so frightened at the terrible Mirabeau that he straightway sought the door, withdrawing from the assembly, however, backwards, as he had been wont to do in retiring from the presence of the king. His instincts were right. He was indeed in the presence of the sovereign, — the newborn sovereign of France.

The triumph of the Third Estate was soon complete. Realizing that it was futile and dangerous longer to oppose the will of the commons, the king ordered those of the nobles and clergy who had not yet joined them to do so, and they obeyed. The States-General thus became in reality the National Assembly.

This union of the three estates in the National Assembly was merely the registering of the result of the silent revolution which through the preceding centuries had been gradually transforming the France of feudal times, made up of the three orders of the clergy, nobility, and Third Estate, into the France of 1789, made up not of orders but of individuals, — of individuals who were already potentially citizens free and equal before the law.

II. The National or Constituent Assembly (June 17, 1789–Sept. 30, 1791)

565. **Prominent Men in the Assembly.** — Lamartine declares that the National Assembly was "the most imposing body of men that ever represented not only France but the human race." It was impressive not so much from the ability or genius of its individual members, though the picked men of France were here gathered, as through the tremendous interest it held in its hands. Yet there were in the Assembly a number of men whose names cannot be passed in silence.



Fig. 89. — Mirabeau. (After a painting by *L. Massard*)

Among the nobility was the patriotic Lafayette, who had won the admiration of his countrymen by splendid services rendered the struggling republic in the New World. His influence at this time was probably greater than that of any other man.

Belonging by birth to the same order, but sitting now as a deputy of the commons, was Mirabeau, a large-headed, dissolute, unscrupulous man, an impetuous orator, the mouthpiece of the Revolution. But though violent in speech he was moderate in counsel. He wanted to right the wrongs of the people, yet without undermining the throne. He wanted reform but not revolution. He aspired to be a leader, but no one at first had

confidence in him, such had been his past life. Arthur Young said of him, "His character is a dead weight upon him." Yet, notwithstanding his lack of private virtues, Mirabeau's qualities of leadership at length gained for him recognition, and he was at one time president of the National Assembly. But his life of dissipation had undermined his constitution. He died in 1791, despairing of the future for France.

Also among the deputies of the Third Estate sat another man whom we must notice, — Robespierre, not much known as yet, but of whom we shall hear enough by and by.

Still another most eminent representative of the commons was Abbé Sieyès, a person of wonderful facility in framing constitutions. France will have much need of such talent, as we shall see. Sieyès had recently stirred the whole country by a remarkable pamphlet entitled *What is the Third Estate?* (*Qu'est-ce que le Tiers État?*). He answers, "Everything!" "What has it been hitherto?" "Nothing!" "What does it wish?" "To be something."

566. Origin of the Revolutionary Commune of Paris; the National Guards.—While the States-General was metamorphosing itself into the National Assembly, the government of Paris was undergoing a somewhat similar transformation. During all these weeks the capital was in a seething ferment. The king at last imprudently began to mass troops about Versailles, as if to overawe the national representatives. The inhabitants of the capital resolved to take precautionary measures. The municipal authorities showing themselves irresolute and timid, the leading men of the different sections or wards of the city ousted them, and then, forming themselves into a sort of provisional city council, assumed the government of the capital. Thus in this moment of tumult and confusion was born the revolutionary Commune of Paris, a body whose power came to overshadow that of the National Assembly itself.

Under the direction of the self-constituted Commune the inhabitants of the capital now formed themselves into a sort of police force. Other cities throughout France imitated Paris and organized their militia. These hastily recruited popular bodies took the

name of National Guards, and under that title were destined to act a most conspicuous part in the scenes of the Revolution.

567. Storming of the Bastille (July 14, 1789). — Thus all Paris was ready to burst into conflagration. The news of the dismissal by the king of Necker, a minister in whom the people had great confidence, kindled the inflammable mass. On the morning of July 14 a great mob assaulted the Bastille, the old state prison and, in the eyes of the people, the emblem of royal despotism. In a few hours the fortress was in the hands of the people. The curious crowds ransacked every corner of the grim old dungeon, liberating the seven prisoners they found in its gloomy cells. The governor and others of the defenders of the place were murdered, their heads placed at the end of pikes, and thus borne through the streets. The walls of the hated old prison were razed to the ground, and the people danced on the spot. The key of the dungeon was sent by Lafayette to Washington "as a trophy of the spoils of despotism." In a letter accompanying the gift, Lafayette wrote: "That the principles of America opened the Bastille is not to be doubted, and therefore the key goes to the right place." [10]

The destruction by the Paris mob of the Bastille was the death knell not only of Bourbon despotism in France but of royal tyranny everywhere. The intelligence of the event was received with rejoicing in America and wherever the ideas and principles of self-government were entertained. When the news reached England, the great statesman Fox, perceiving its significance for liberty, exclaimed, "How much is this the greatest event that ever happened in the world, and how much the best!"

Louis XVI regarded the matter with different feelings. When news of the affair was carried to him at Versailles he exclaimed, "What, *Rebellion!*" "No, sire," was the response; "it is *Revolution.*" The great French Revolution had indeed begun.

568. The Abolition of Privileges (August 4, 1789). — As the news of the storming of the Bastille spread through France the peasantry in many districts, following the example set them by

[10] The rusty relic may be seen to-day in a case at Mount Vernon.

the capital, destroyed the local bastilles and sacked and burned the castles of the nobles. The main object of the peasants was to destroy the title deeds in the archives of the manor houses, since it was by virtue of these charters that the lords exercised so many rights over the lands of the peasants and exacted so many teasing and iniquitous tolls and dues. This terrorism caused the beginning of what is known as the emigration of the nobles, that is, their flight beyond the frontiers of France.

The storm without hastened matters within the National Assembly at Versailles. The privileged orders now realized that, to save themselves from the fury of the masses, they must give up those vexatious feudal privileges which were a main cause of the sufferings and the anger of the people. Rising in the tribune, two young and liberal-minded members of the nobility represented that they were willing to renounce all their feudal rights and exemptions. A contagious enthusiasm was awakened by this act of patriotic generosity. The impulsiveness of the Gallic heart was never better illustrated. Everybody wanted to make sacrifices for the common good. The nobles and the clergy, crowding to the tribune, strove with one another in generous rivalry to see who should make the greatest sacrifices in the surrender of rents, tolls, fees, feudal dues, and gaming privileges. Thus in a single night much of the rubbish of the broken-down feudal system was cleared away.

569. **The Declaration of the Rights of Man** (August 26, 1789). — After the abolition of the feudal system the next work of the National Assembly was the drawing up of a Declaration of the Rights of Man. This was in imitation of what had been done by the American patriots.

The dominant notes of the Declaration were (1) the equality of men, — "Men are born and remain free and equal"; (2) the sovereignty of the people, — "All sovereignty resides essentially in the nation"; (3) the impartial nature of law, — "Law is the expression of the general will . . . and should be the same for all"; and (4) the inviolability of personal liberty, — "No person shall be arrested or imprisoned save according to the forms of law."

570. "To Versailles"; the Royal Family taken to Paris (Oct. 6, 1789). —An imprudent act on the part of the king and his friends at Versailles brought about the next episode in the progress of the Revolution. The arrival there of a body of troops was made the occasion of a banquet to the officers of the regiment. While heated with wine the young nobles had trampled underfoot the national tricolored cockades, and substituted for them white cockades, the emblem of the Bourbons. The report of these proceedings caused in Paris the wildest excitement. Rumors of the intended flight of the king to Metz, and of plots against the national cause, added fuel to the flames. Besides, bread had failed, and the poorer classes were savage from hunger.

On the 5th of October a mob of desperate women collected in the streets of Paris, determined upon going to Versailles and demanding relief from the king himself. A horrible multitude, savage as the hordes that followed Attila, streamed out of the city towards Versailles. The National Guards, infected with the delirium of the moment, forced their commander, Lafayette, to lead them in the same direction. Thus all day Paris emptied itself into the royal suburb.

The mob encamped in the streets of Versailles for the night. Early the following morning they broke into the palace, killed two of the guards, and forced their way to the chamber of the queen, who barely escaped with her life to the king's apartments. The timely arrival of Lafayette alone saved the entire royal family from being massacred.

The mob now demanded that the king should go with them to Paris. Louis was constrained to yield. The procession arrived at Paris in the evening. The royal family were placed in the palace of the Tuileries, and Lafayette was charged with the duty of guarding the king, who was to be held as a sort of hostage for the good conduct of the nobles and the foreign sovereigns while the new constitution was being prepared by the Assembly, which had followed the king to the capital.

Such was what was called the Joyous Entry of October 6. The palace at Versailles, thus stripped of royalty and left bespattered

with blood, was destined never again to be occupied as the residence of a king of France.

571. **Nationalization of Church Property** (Nov. 2, 1789); **the Civil Constitution of the Clergy** (July 12, 1790). — For two years following the Joyous Entry there was a comparative lull in the storm of the Revolution. The king was kept a close prisoner in the Tuileries. The National Assembly was making sweeping reforms both in State and Church, and busying itself in framing a new constitution. One of the most important of its measures and one far-reaching in its effects was the confiscation of the property of the Church. Altogether, property consisting largely of lands, and worth it is estimated over a billion francs, was by decree made the property of the nation.[11]

The nationalization of the property of the Church rendered it necessary that the nation should make some provision for the support of the clergy. This was done a little later by a decree known as the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. The decree provided for a new division of France into archbishoprics, bishoprics, and parishes, and for the support of all ministers of religion by reasonable salaries paid by the nation. All the clergy, bishops, and parish priests alike were to be chosen by election, and all were to be required to take oath to support the new constitution.

Naturally this conversion of the Church in France into an established national Church created a schism in the nation. Out of a hundred and thirty-four bishops only four would take the prescribed oath. From this time on a large section of the French clergy became the bitter enemies of the Revolution.

572. **Flight and Arrest of the King** (June 20, 1791). — The attempt of the king to make his way out of France and join the emigrant nobles now gave an entirely new turn to the course of the Revolution. Under cover of night the royal family in disguise

[11] It being found impossible to sell at once and at fair prices so large an amount of real estate, the Assembly, using the nationalized lands as security, issued against them currency notes, called *assignats*. As almost always happens in such cases, inflation of the currency resulted. Fresh issues of notes were made until they became quite worthless, as in the case of the Continental notes issued by the Continental Congress in the American War of Independence.

escaped from the Tuileries, and by post conveyance fled towards the frontier. When just a few hours more would have placed the fugitives in safety among friends, the Bourbon features of the king betrayed him, and the entire party was arrested and carried back to Paris.

The attempted flight of the royal family was a fatal blow to the monarchy. It deepened the growing distrust of the king. Many affected to regard it as equivalent on his part to an act of abdication. The people began to talk of a republic. The word was only whispered as yet; but it was not long before those who did not shout vociferously, "*Vive la République!*" were hurried to the guillotine.

573. **The Clubs: Jacobins and Cordeliers.** — In order to render intelligible the further course of the Revolution we must now speak of two clubs, or organizations, which came into prominence about this time, and which were destined to become more powerful than the Assembly itself, and to be the chief instruments in inaugurating the Reign of Terror. These were the societies of the Jacobins and the Cordeliers.[12] The objects of these clubs were to watch for conspiracies of the Royalists and by constant agitation to keep alive the flame of the Revolution.

574. **The New Constitution.** — The work of the National Assembly was now drawing to a close. On the 14th of September, 1791, the new constitution framed by the body, which instrument made the government of France a constitutional monarchy, was solemnly ratified by the king. The National Assembly, having sat over two years, then adjourned. The first scene in the drama of the French Revolution was ended.

III. The Legislative Assembly (Oct. 1, 1791–Sept. 19, 1792)

575. **The Membership of the Assembly; the Constitutionalists and the Girondins.** — The new constitution provided for a national legislature to be called the Legislative Assembly. This body

[12] The Jacobins were so called from an old convent in which their first meetings were held; the Cordeliers were named after a Franciscan convent where they assembled.

was made up of several groups or parties, of which we need here notice only the Feuillants or Constitutionalists and the Girondins. The Constitutionalists, as their name implies, supported the new constitution, being in favor of a limited monarchy. The Girondins, so called from the department (the Gironde) whence their most noted leaders came, wanted to establish in France a federal republic like that just set up in the New World.

576. **The Temper of the Assembly.** — Some seemingly trivial matters will serve to illustrate the spirit of the new Assembly. At the very outset the members were much perplexed in regard to how they should address the king and "wound neither the national dignity nor the royal dignity." Some were for using the titles Sire and Majesty, against which others indignantly protested, declaring that "the law and the people are the only *Majesty*." It was finally decided that Louis XVI should be called simply King of the French.

Another thing which troubled the republican members was the gilded throne in which the king was wont to sit when he visited the Assembly. It was resolved that this article should be removed and an ordinary chair substituted for it, this to be placed *in exact line* with that occupied by the president of the Assembly.

Again there were objections raised to the ceremony of the members rising and standing uncovered in the king's presence. So it was decreed that the members might sit before royalty with their hats on.

577. **Beginning of War with the Old Monarchies** (April 20, 1792). — The kings of Europe were watching with the utmost concern the course of events in France. They regarded the cause of Louis XVI as their own. If the French people should be allowed to overturn the throne of their hereditary sovereign, who any longer would have respect for the divine right of kings?

The warlike preparations of Austria, which had entered into an offensive and defensive alliance with Prussia, awakened the apprehensions of the Revolutionists, and led the Legislative Assembly to declare war against that power (April 20, 1792). A little later the allied armies of the Austrians and Prussians

crossed the frontiers of France. Thus was taken the first step in a series of wars which were destined to last nearly a quarter of a century, and in which France almost single-handed was to struggle against the leagued powers of Europe and to illustrate the miracles possible to enthusiasm and genius.

578. **The Massacre of the Swiss Guards** (August 10, 1792). — The allies at first gained easy victories over the ill-disciplined

FIG. 90. — THE LION OF LUCERNE. (From a photograph)

This celebrated sculpture commemorates the loyalty and faithfulness of the Swiss guards who gave their lives in defense of the royal palace at Paris, August 10, 1792. See p. 522, n. 14

forces of the Legislative Assembly, and the Duke of Brunswick, commander of the Prussian army, advanced rapidly upon Paris. An insolent proclamation which this general now issued (July 25, 1792), wherein he ordered the French nation to submit to their king, and threatened the Parisians with the destruction of their city should any harm be done the royal family, drove the French people frantic with indignation and rage.

The first outbreak of the popular fury occurred in Paris. The mob of the capital was swollen by the arrival of bands of picked

men from other parts of France. From the south came the "six hundred Marseillais who knew how to die." They brought with them "a better contingent than ten thousand pikemen," — the Marseillaise Hymn, the martial song of the Revolution.[13]

On the morning of the 10th of August the hordes of the city were mustered. The Palace of the Tuileries, defended by several hundred Swiss soldiers, the remnant of the royal guard, was assaulted. The royal family fled for safety to the hall of the Assembly near by. A terrible struggle followed in the corridors and upon the grand stairways of the palace. The Swiss stood "steadfast as the granite of their Alps." But they were overwhelmed at last, and all were killed, either in the building itself or in the surrounding courts and streets.[14]

579. **The Massacre of September ("Jail Delivery").** — The army of the allies hurried on towards the capital to avenge the slaughter of the royal guards and to rescue the king. Paris was all excitement. "We must stop the enemy," cried Danton, "by striking terror into the Royalists." To this end the most atrocious measures were now adopted. It was resolved that the Royalists confined in the jails of the capital should be killed. A hundred or more men acted as executioners, and to them the prisoners were handed over after a hasty examination before self-appointed judges. When the assassins grew weary refreshments were brought them, — "bread and wine for the laborers who were delivering the nation from its enemies." Refreshed by the bread and the wine, they resumed their work of emancipating France.

The number of victims of this terrible "September Massacre," as it is called, is estimated[15] at from eight hundred to fourteen

[13] This famous war song was composed in 1792 by Rouget de Lisle, a young French engineer.

[14] The number of Swiss guards slain was over seven hundred. Their fidelity and devotion are commemorated by one of the most impressive monuments in Europe, the so-called "Lion of Lucerne," at Lucerne in Switzerland. In a large recess in a cliff a dying lion, pierced by a lance, protects with its paw the Bourbon lilies. The wonderfully lifelike figure is cut out of the natural rock. The designer of the memorial was the celebrated Danish sculptor Thorvaldsen.

[15] Former estimates are now known to have been exaggerated. See Stephens, *History of the French Revolution*, vol. ii, p. 146.

hundred. Europe had never before known such a "jail delivery." It was the greatest crime of the French Revolution.

580. **Defeat of the Allies.** — Meanwhile, in the open field, the fortunes of war inclined to the side of the Revolutionists. The French army in the north was successful in checking the advance of the allies, and finally at Valmy (Sept. 20, 1792) succeeded in inflicting upon them a decisive defeat, which caused their hasty retreat beyond the frontiers of France. The day of this victory the Legislative Assembly came to an end, and the same day the National Convention assembled.

IV. The National Convention (Sept. 20, 1792–Oct. 26, 1795)

581. **Parties in the Convention.** — The Convention, consisting of seven hundred and forty-nine deputies, among whom was the celebrated freethinker, Thomas Paine, embraced two active groups, the Girondins and the Mountainists,[16] the latter being so named from the circumstance that they sat on the upper benches in the Assembly hall. There were no monarchists; all were republicans. No one dared to speak of a monarchy.

It was the Mountainists who were to shape the measures of the Convention. Their leaders were Danton and Robespierre, deputies of Paris. The party was inferior in numbers to that of the Girondins, but was superior in energy and daring, and was moreover backed by the Parisian mob. Its leaders wanted a strong government, which they believed should be maintained, if necessary, by a system of terror.

582. **The Establishment of the Republic** (Sept. 21, 1792); **Beginning of the Revolutionary Propaganda.** — Almost the first act of the Convention was to abolish the monarchy. The motion for the abolition of royalty was not even discussed. "What need is there for discussion," exclaimed a delegate, "where all are agreed?

[16] There was a third group, comprising the great majority of the deputies, and known as the "Plain" or "Marsh," who had no well-formulated policy, and who acted sometimes with the Girondins and sometimes with the Mountainists.

Courts are the hotbed of crime, the focus of corruption; the history of kings is the martyrology of nations."

All titles of nobility were also abolished. Every one was to be addressed simply as *citizen*. In the debates of the Convention the king was alluded to as Citizen Capet, and on the street the shoeblack was called Citizen Shoeblack.

The day following the establishment of the Republic (Sept. 22, 1792) was made the beginning of a new era, the first day of the YEAR I. That was to be regarded as the natal day of Liberty. A little later, incited by the success of the French armies, the Convention called upon all nations to rise against despotism, and pledged the aid of France to any people wishing to secure freedom.

This call to the peoples of Europe to rise against their kings and to set up republican governments converted the revolutionary movement in France into a propaganda, and naturally made more implacable than ever the hatred toward the Revolution felt by all lovers and beneficiaries of the old order of things. The declaration was a main cause of the fresh coalition formed against the new Republic and of the war of 1793.

583. **Trial and Execution of the King** (Jan. 21, 1793). — The next work of the Convention was the trial and execution of the king. He was brought before the bar of that body, charged with having conspired with the enemies of France, of having opposed the will of the people, and of having caused the massacre of the 10th of August.

The sentence of the Convention was immediate death. On Jan. 21, 1793, the unfortunate monarch, after a last sad interview with his wife and children, was conducted to the scaffold. As his head fell beneath the knife of the guillotine, a great shout, "*Vive la République!*" burst from the surrounding multitudes, and echoed through the empty halls of the neighboring palace of the Tuileries.

584. **Coalition against France; the Counter-Revolution in La Vendée.** — The regicide, together with the propaganda decree of the preceding year, awakened among all the old monarchies of Europe the most bitter hostility against the French Revolutionists.

The act was interpreted as a threat against all kings. A grand coalition, embracing England, Austria, Prussia, the Protestant Netherlands, Spain, Portugal, Sardinia, Tuscany, Naples, and the Holy Roman Empire, was formed to crush the republican movement. Armies aggregating more than a quarter of a million of men threatened France at once on every frontier.

While thus beset with foes without, the Republic was threatened with even more dangerous enemies within. The people of La Vendée, in Western France, where the peasants were angered at the conscription decrees of the Convention, and where there was still a strong sentiment of loyalty to the Church and the monarchy, rose in revolt against the Revolutionists.

585. **Creation of the Revolutionary Tribunal** (March 10, 1793) **and of the Committee of Public Safety** (April 6, 1793). — The defeat of the French armies in the north and the advance of the allies caused the greatest excitement among the Parisian populace, who now demanded that the Convention should overawe the domestic enemies of the Revolution by the establishment of a judicial dictatorship, a sort of tribunal which should take cognizance of all crimes against the Republic.

Danton, while acknowledging the injustice that the summary processes of such a court might do to many unjustly suspected, justified its establishment by arguing that in time of peace society lets the guilty escape rather than harm the innocent; but in times of public danger it should rather strike down the innocent than allow the guilty to escape. It was on this principle that France was to be governed for one terrible year.

A little later was organized what was called the Committee of Public Safety, consisting of nine persons, members of the Convention. It was invested with dictatorial power. Danton, who became the leading member of the Committee, urged the formation of this arbitrary executive body as the only expedient which would enable the nation to act with that dispatch and energy needful to save the Republic. "We must establish a despotism of liberty," cried Marat, a prominent chief of the Cordeliers, "to crush the despotism of kings." The vast powers wielded

by the Committee were delegated to it for a single month only, but were renewed from month to month.

We must bear in mind the character of these two bodies in order to follow intelligently the subsequent events of the Revolution, and to understand how the atrocious tyranny of the Reign of Terror was exercised and maintained.

586. **The Fall of the Girondins** (June 2, 1793). — Still gloomier tidings came from every quarter, — news of reverses to the armies of the Republic in front of the allies, and of successes of the counter-revolutionists in La Vendée. The Mountainists in the Convention, supported by the rabble of Paris, urged the most extreme measures. They proposed that the carriages of the wealthy should be seized and used for carrying soldiers to the seat of war, and that the expenses of the government should be met by forced contributions from the rich.

The Girondins opposed these communistic measures. The Parisian mob filled the city with cries of "Down with the Girondins!" "If the person of the people's representative be violated," warningly exclaimed one of the Girondin orators, "Paris will be destroyed, and soon the stranger will be compelled to inquire on which bank of the Seine the city stood."

The Girondins were finally overborne. An immense mob surrounded the hall of the Convention and demanded that their chiefs be given up as enemies of the Republic. Thirty-one of their leaders were surrendered and placed under arrest, a preliminary step to the speedy execution of many of them during the opening days of the Reign of Terror. Thus did the Parisian mob purge the National Convention of France, as the army purged Parliament in the English Revolution (sec. 474).

587. **Charlotte Corday; Assassination of Marat** (July 13, 1793). — The arrest of the Girondin chiefs marks a turning point in the Revolution. Several escaped and attempted to stir up revolt in the provinces against the revolutionary leaders in Paris. Civil war was impending.

At this juncture a maiden of Caen, in Normandy, Charlotte Corday by name, conceived the idea of delivering France from

the terrors of proscription and civil war by going to Paris and killing Marat, whom she regarded as the leader of the Mountainists. On pretense of wishing to reveal to him something of importance, she gained admission to his rooms and stabbed him fatally. She atoned for the act under the knife of the guillotine.

The Reign of Terror (September,[17] 1793–July, 1794)

588. **The Great Committee of Public Safety; its Principle of Government.** — The perilous situation created by domestic insurrection and foreign invasion demanded a strong executive. It was created. The Convention reorganized the Committee of Public Safety, which now became what is known as the Great Committee of Public Safety, suspended the constitution, and invested the new board with supreme executive authority. For almost a full year the twelve men — of whom Robespierre was the most conspicuous — constituting this body exercised absolute power over the life and property of every person in France. The Committee's principle of government was simple. It governed by terror.[18] Its rule is known as the "Reign of Terror."

In order to understand in any measure this passage of French history, we must put ourselves at the viewpoint of the Terrorists, as those responsible for the Terror are called. The most, if not all, of the men constituting the Great Committee were men of character, — some of their agents were unworthy creatures, who, misusing their authority, committed incredible crimes, — men governed by certain principles and ideals which seemed to them right and worthy. They were men who had persuaded themselves that opposition to the Revolution was a crime deserving death, and that France could be saved from anarchy and foreign subjection only by the quick and thorough suppression of all opposition at home by the terrifying executions of the guillotine. For

[17] The beginning of the Reign of Terror cannot be dated with precision.

[18] It is illuminative to set the principle of government of the Terrorists in contrast with that of one of the most lovable of the Girondins. "They have sought to effect the Revolution by terror," said the great orator Vergniaud; "I have wished to effect it by love."

the same reasons the majority of the people of France acquiesced in this government by terror which the Committee established.

589. **The Execution of Marie Antoinette** (Oct. 16, 1793). — One of the earliest victims of the guillotine under the organized Terror was the queen. The attention of the Revolutionists had been turned anew to the remaining members of the royal family by reason of the recognition by the allies of the Dauphin as king of France,[19] and by the recent alarming successes of their armies.



FIG. 91. — THE GUILLOTINE

The queen, who had now borne nine months' imprisonment, was brought before the terrible Revolutionary Tribunal and condemned to the guillotine. She was conveyed in a common cart to the same spot where, less than a year before, her husband had suffered. When she first appeared in the chamber of the dread tribunal, with her robes disordered, her hair blanched from anguish, and her face furrowed with sorrow, — so changed from that fair vision of beauty once the center of the brilliant court of Versailles,[20] — a wave of pity had rushed over the hearts of all beholders; but the rising tide of sentiment had been checked, and now a hideous mob of men and women howled with savage delight around the cart which bore the unhappy queen to the scaffold.

[19] The Dauphin, a mere child of eight years, was recognized as king of France by several of the great powers in January, 1793. He was at this time a prisoner in the Temple. He died in 1795, his death having been caused or at least hastened by the brutal ill usage he received at the hands of his jailers.

[20] "It is now sixteen or seventeen years since I saw the queen of France, then the Dauphiness, at Versailles; and surely never lighted on this orb, which she hardly seemed to touch, a more delightful vision. I saw her just above the horizon, decorating and cheering the elevated sphere she just had begun to move in, — glittering like the morning star, full of life and splendor and joy." — BURKE, *Reflections on the French Revolution.*

We need not speak of the faults of Marie Antoinette, though they were many; her patience, her heroism, and her sufferings were ample atonement for them all.

590. **Execution of the Girondins** (Oct. 31, 1793) **and of Madame Roland** (Nov. 8, 1793). — The guillotine was now fed daily with the best blood of France. Two weeks after the execution of the queen twenty of the chiefs of the Girondins, who had been kept in confinement since their arrest in the Convention, were pushed beneath the knife. Hundreds of others followed.

Most illustrious of all the victims after the queen was Madame Roland, who was accused of being the friend of the Girondins. An incident at the scaffold is related as a memorial of her. As she was about to lay her head beneath the knife, her eye, it is said, chanced to fall upon the statue of Liberty which stood near the scaffold. "O Liberty!" she exclaimed; "what crimes are committed in thy name!"

It has ever been so. The worst crimes that stain the pages of history have been committed in the name of that which is holiest, — in the name of Liberty, or of Justice, or of Religion.

591. **The New Calendar.** — While the Revolutionary Tribunal was clearing out of the way the enemies of the Republic by the quick processes of the guillotine, the Convention was busy reforming the ancient institutions and customs of the land. They hated these as having been established by kings and aristocrats to enhance their own importance and to enslave the masses. They proposed to sweep these things all aside and give the world a fresh start.

A new uniform system of weights and measures, known as the metric,[21] had already been planned by the National Assembly; a new mode of reckoning time was now introduced. The months were given new names, names expressive of the character of each. Each month was divided into three periods of ten days each, called *decades*, and each day into ten parts. The tenth day of each decade took the place of the old Sabbath. The five odd days not provided for in the arrangement were made festival days.

21 This reform was a most admirable one and must be regarded as one of the good outcomes of the Revolution.

592. **Attempt to abolish Christianity** (Nov. 7, 1793). — The old calendar having been abolished, the Revolutionists next proceeded to abolish Christianity. Some of the chiefs of the Commune of Paris declared that the Revolution should not rest until it had "dethroned the King of Heaven as well as the kings of earth." An attempt was made by the extremists to have Christianity abolished by a decree of the National Convention; but that body prudently resolved that all matters of creeds should be left to the decision of the people themselves. The atheistic leaders then determined to effect their purpose through the Church itself. They persuaded the Bishop of Paris, Gobel by name, to abdicate his office; and his example was followed by many of the clergy throughout the country.

The churches of Paris and of other cities were now closed, and the treasures of their altars and shrines confiscated to the state. Even the bells were melted down into cannon. The images of the Virgin and of the Christ were torn down, and the busts of Marat and other patriots set up in their stead. And as the emancipation of the world was now to be wrought not by the Cross but by the guillotine, that instrument took the place of the crucifix, and was called the "Holy Guillotine." In many places all visible symbols of the ancient religion were destroyed; all emblems of hope in some cemeteries were obliterated, and over their gates were inscribed the words, "Death is eternal sleep."

593. **Inauguration of the Worship of Reason** (Nov. 10, 1793). — The madness of the people culminated in the worship of Reason. A celebrated beauty, personating the Goddess of Reason, was set upon the altar of Notre Dame in Paris as an object of homage and worship.

The example of Paris was followed generally throughout France. Churches were converted into temples of the new worship. The Sabbath having been abolished, the services of the temple were held only upon every tenth day. On that day the mayor or some popular leader mounted the altar and harangued the people, dwelling upon the news of the moment, the triumphs of the armies of the Republic, the glorious achievements of the Revolution, and

the privilege of living in an era when one was oppressed neither by kings on earth nor by a King in Heaven.

594. **Fall of Hébert and Danton** (March and April, 1794).— Not many months of the Reign of Terror had passed before the Revolutionists, having destroyed or driven into obscurity their common enemy, the Girondins and their sympathizers, turned upon one another with the ferocity of beasts whose appetite has been whetted by the taste of blood.

During the progress of events the Jacobins had become divided into three factions, headed respectively by Danton, Robespierre, and Hébert. Danton had been a bold and audacious leader,[22] but was now adopting a more conservative tone, and was condemning as no longer necessary the government by terror which was being maintained by the Great Committee of Public Safety.

Hébert was one of the worst demagogues of the Commune of Paris, the chief and instigator of the Parisian rabble. He was the editor of a vile and blasphemous sheet called *Père Duchesne*, the most audacious and inflammatory of the innumerable newspapers and pamphlets which appeared during the Reign of Terror. He and his followers would overturn everything and refound society upon communism and atheism.

Robespierre occupied a position midway between these two, condemning alike the moderatism of Danton and the atheistic communism of Hébert. To make his own power supreme he resolved to crush both.

Hébert and his party were the first to fall, Danton and his adherents working with Robespierre to bring about their ruin. Danton and his party were the next to follow. Little more than a week had passed since the execution of Hébert before Robespierre had effected their destruction on the charge of conspiring with the counter-revolutionists. The last words of Danton to the executioner were, "Show my head to the people; they do not see the like every day." The grim request was granted.

With the anarchists and moderates both destroyed, Robespierre was supreme. His ambition was attained. "He stood

[22] He was a member of the first Committee of Public Safety, but not of the second.

alone on the awful eminence of the Holy Mountain." But his turn was soon to come.

595. **Worship of the Supreme Being.** — One of the first acts of Robespierre after he had freed himself from his most virulent enemies was to give France a new religion in place of the worship of Reason. Robespierre wished to sweep away Christianity as a superstition, but he would stop at deism. He did not believe that a state could be founded on atheism. "If God did not exist," he declared, "it would behoove man to invent Him."

FIG. 92. — ROBESPIERRE
(From a French print)

In a remarkable address delivered before the Convention on the 7th of May, 1794, Robespierre eloquently defended the doctrines of God and immortality, and then closed his speech by offering for adoption this decree: "(1) The French people recognize the existence of the Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul; (2) they recognize that the worship most worthy of the Supreme Being is the practice of the duties of man; and (3) they put in the first rank of these duties to detest bad faith and tyranny, to punish tyrants and traitors, to rescue the unfortunate, to defend the oppressed, to do to others all the good one can, and to be unjust towards none." [23]

The Convention adopted the resolution with the "utmost enthusiasm." The Jacobins appeared by a committee before the Assembly and thanked them for the grand decree. Similar congratulations came from all parts of France. The churches which had been converted into temples of the Goddess of Reason were now consecrated to the new worship of the Supreme Being.

596. **The Culmination of the Terror at Paris** (June and July, 1794). — At the same time that Robespierre was instituting the

[23] Stephens, *The Principal Speeches of the Statesmen and Orators of the French Revolution*, vol. ii, p. 416.

new worship, the Great Committee of Public Safety, of which he was generally regarded as the controlling spirit, was ruling France by a terrorism unparalleled since the most frightful days at Rome. The Revolutionary Tribunal had been entirely unhampered in its modes of procedure, and "moral conviction" on the part of the judges of the guilt of a person was all that was necessary upon which to ground a verdict of death. The Convention, affrighted by the monster it had itself brought forth, was cowering before it.

With all power thus gathered in its hands, the Committee proceeded to overawe all opposition and dissent by the wholesale slaughters of the guillotine. The prisons of Paris and of the departments were filled with suspected persons, until two hundred thousand prisoners were crowded into these republican bastilles. At Paris the dungeons were emptied of their victims and room made for fresh ones by the swift processes of the Revolutionary Tribunal, which in mockery of justice caused the prisoners to be brought before its bar in companies of ten or fifty or more. Rank or talent was an inexpiable crime. "Were you not a noble?" asked the president of the tribunal of one of the accused. "Yes," was the reply. "Enough; another," was the judge's verdict. And so on through the long list each day brought before the court.

The scenes about the guillotine seem mirrored from the *Inferno* of Dante. Benches were arranged around the scaffold and rented to spectators, like seats in a theater. The market women of Paris, the same women who had made the march to Versailles in the opening days of the Revolution, and who were now known as "the Furies of the Guillotine," busied themselves with their knitting while watching the changing scenes of the bloody spectacle. In the space of seven weeks (June 10–July 27) the number of persons guillotined at Paris was thirteen hundred and seventy-six, — an average of over twenty-eight a day.

597. The Terror in the Provinces. — While such was the frightful state of things at the capital, matters were even worse in several of the provinces. Some of the cities, including Lyons, Bordeaux, Marseilles, and Toulon, which had been prominent centers of

the counter-revolution incited by the arrest of the Girondins (sec. 586), were made a terrible example of the vengeance of the Revolutionists. Lyons was to them an object of special hatred. Respecting this place the Convention passed the following decree: "The city of Lyons shall be destroyed; every house occupied by a rich man shall be demolished." The decree was in part actually carried into execution, one of the most aristocratic quarters of the city being pulled down.

At Nantes, in the Vendéan district, the terror culminated. The agent here of the Great Committee was one Carrier. At first he caused his victims to be shot singly or to be guillotined; but finding these methods too slow, he devised more expeditious modes of execution, which were known as *fusillades* (battues) and *noyades* (drownings). The *fusillades* consisted in gathering the victims in large companies and then mowing them down with cannon and musket. In the *noyades* a hundred or more persons were crowded into an old hulk, which was then towed out into the Loire and scuttled.

By these various methods Carrier succeeded in destroying upwards of five thousand persons in about four months. What renders these murders the more atrocious is the fact that a considerable number of the victims were women and little children.

598. **The Fall of Robespierre** (July 28, 1794); **Punishment of the Terrorists.** — The Reign of Terror had lasted about nine months when a reaction came. The successes of the armies of the Republic and the establishment of the authority of the Convention throughout the departments caused the people to look upon the wholesale executions that were daily taking place as unnecessary and cruel. They began to turn with horror and pity from the scenes of the guillotine.

Robespierre was the first to be swept away by the reaction. The Convention denounced him and his adherents as enemies of the Republic. He was arrested, rescued by the rabble of Paris, rearrested and straightway sent to the guillotine, and along with him several of his friends and the greater part of the members of the Commune of Paris.

The reaction which had swept away Robespierre and his associates continued after their fall. There was a general demand for the punishment of the Terrorists. The clubs of the Jacobins were closed, and that infamous society which had rallied and directed the hideous rabbles of the great cities was broken up. The Christian worship was reëstablished. The busts of Marat were thrown down, broken in pieces, and flung into the gutter.

599. **Effects of the Reign of Terror.** — The effect of the Terror upon France was just what the Terrorists had aimed to produce. It effectually cowed all opposition at home to the Revolution, thereby preserving the unity of France and enabling her to push the foreign foe from her soil.

Outside of France the effects of the rule by terror were most unfavorable to the true cause of the Revolutionists. It destroyed the illusions of generous souls, like Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Southey in England, and caused among the earlier sympathizers with the Revolutionists a great revulsion of feeling. From being Liberals men became Conservatives and determined foes of all innovation and reform. The Revolution was discredited in the eyes of its best friends. It became identified in men's minds with atheism and terrorism, and to the present hour in the minds of many the French Revolution suggests nothing save foul blasphemies and guillotine horrors.

600. **Bonaparte defends the Convention** (Oct. 5, 1795). — Experience had shown the defects of the revolutionary government, particularly in that it united both legislative and executive power in the same hands. The Convention now set about framing a new constitution, which vested the executive power in a body called the Directory, consisting of five persons. It also provided for two legislative bodies,[24] known as the Council of Five Hundred and the Council of Ancients.

The Convention, fearing to surrender its authority into the hands of an entirely new assembly, had provided that two thirds

[24] The hasty and often ill-considered decrees of the Convention had shown the necessity of putting a check upon legislation by the creation of an Upper and a Lower House.

of the representatives in the new legislature should be chosen from the deputies of the old body. This displeased the Parisian mob. The sections of the turbulent capital again gathered their hordes, and on the 5th of October, 1795, a mob of forty thousand men advanced to the attack of the Tuileries, where the Convention was sitting. As the mob came on they were met by a "whiff of grapeshot," which sent them flying back in wild disorder. The man who trained the guns was a young artillery officer, a native of the island of Corsica, — Napoleon Bonaparte.[25] The Revolution had at last brought forth a man of genius capable of controlling and directing its tremendous energies.

V. The Directory (Oct. 27, 1795–Nov. 9, 1799)

601. The Republic becomes Aggressive. — Under the Directory the Republic, which up to this time had been acting mainly on the defensive, very soon entered upon an aggressive policy. The Revolution having accomplished its work in France, having there destroyed royal despotism and abolished class privilege, now set itself about fulfilling its early promise of giving liberty to all peoples (sec. 582). In a word, the Revolution became what has been called "an armed propaganda." France now exhibits what her historians call her social, her communicative genius. "Easily seduced herself," as Lamartine says, "she easily seduces others." She would make all Europe like unto herself. Herself a republic, she would make all nations republics.

Had not the minds and hearts of the people in all the neighboring countries been prepared to welcome the new order of things, the Revolution could never have spread itself as widely as it did. But everywhere irrepressible longings for social and political equality and freedom, born of long oppression, were stirring the souls of men. The French armies were everywhere welcomed by the people as deliverers. Thus was France enabled to surround

[25] The Convention had intrusted its defense to the deputy Barras, who had selected Bonaparte as his lieutenant on account of the reputation he had made for himself at the siege of Toulon in 1793.

herself with a girdle of commonwealths. She conquered Europe not by her armies but by her ideas. "An invasion of armies," says Victor Hugo, "can be resisted: an invasion of ideas cannot be resisted."

The republics established were indeed short-lived; for the times were not yet ripe for the complete triumph of democratic ideas. But a great gain for freedom was made. The reëstablished monarchies, as we shall see later, never dared to make themselves as despotic as those which the Revolution had overturned.

602. The Plans of the Directory. — Austria and England were the only formidable powers that still persisted in their hostility to the Republic.[26] The Directors resolved to strike a decisive blow at the first of these implacable foes. To carry out their design, two large armies, numbering about seventy thousand each, were mustered upon the Middle Rhine and intrusted to the command of the two young and energetic generals, Moreau and Jourdan, who were to make a direct invasion of Germany. A third army, numbering about forty-two thousand men, was assembled in the neighborhood of Nice, in Southeastern France, and placed in the hands of Bonaparte, to whom was assigned the work of driving the Austrians out of Italy.

603. Bonaparte's Italian Campaign (1796–1797). — Straightway upon receiving his command, Bonaparte, now in his twenty-seventh year, animated by visions of military glory to be gathered on the fields of Italy, hastened to join his army at Nice. He found the discontented soldiers almost without food or clothes. He at once aroused all their latent enthusiasm by one of those short, stirring addresses for which he afterwards became so famous. "Soldiers," said he, "you are badly fed and almost naked. . . . I have come to lead you into the most fertile fields of the world; there you will find large cities, rich provinces, honor, glory, and wealth. Soldiers of Italy, will you fail in courage?"

If this address be placed alongside the decree of the Convention offering the aid of France to all peoples desiring freedom

[26] Prussia, Spain, and other states had made the Treaties of Basel with the Convention, in which they recognized the French Republic (1795).

(sec. 582), it will be realized with how alien a spirit Bonaparte here inspires the armies of republican France. He represents Italy to the imagination of the soldiers of the French Republic merely as a country of rich cities to be despoiled, as a land whence France may draw unlimited tribute. The address marks the beginning of that transformation which in a few years changed the liberating armies of France into the scourge of Europe.

Before the mountain roads were yet free from snow Bonaparte set in motion his army, which he had assembled on the coast near Genoa, and suddenly forced the passage of the mountains at the juncture of the Apennines and the Maritime Alps. The Carthaginian had been surpassed. "Hannibal," exclaimed Bonaparte, "crossed the Alps; as for us, we have turned them."

This blow separated the Sardinian and Austrian armies. Within two weeks the Sardinians were completely defeated and forced to sue for peace. Now followed a most astonishing series of French victories over the Austrians.[27] As a result of the campaign a considerable part of Northern Italy was formed into a commonwealth under the name of the Cisalpine Republic. Genoa was also transformed into the Ligurian Republic.

604. Treaty of Campo Formio (Oct. 17, 1797). — While Bonaparte had been gaining his surprising victories in Italy, Moreau and Jourdan had been meeting with severe reverses in Germany. Bonaparte, having effected the work assigned to the army of Italy, now climbed the Eastern Alps and marched toward Vienna. The near approach of the French to his capital induced the Emperor Francis II to listen to proposals of peace. An armistice was agreed upon, and later the important Treaty of Campo Formio was arranged.

By the terms of this treaty Austria ceded her Belgian provinces to the French Republic, recognized the Rhine as the eastern frontier of France, and acknowledged the independence of the Cisalpine Republic. As an offset to her losses Austria received

[27] Among the noted engagements of the campaign were the battles of Lodi (May 10, 1796), Castiglione (August 5, 1796), Arcola (Nov. 15–17, 1796), Rivoli (Jan. 14, 15, 1797), and the siege of Mantua (July, 1796–February, 1797).

the Venetian dominions, save the Ionian Islands, which were annexed to the French Republic. Bonaparte was already dazzled by the vision of a French empire in the Orient. The Grecian isles were to constitute a link in the chain which should bind France to her prospective Eastern dependencies.

With the treaty arranged, Bonaparte soon set out for Paris, where a triumph and ovation such as Europe had not seen since the days of the old Roman conquerors was accorded him.

605. Bonaparte's Campaign in Egypt (1798–1799). — The Directors had received Bonaparte with apparent enthusiasm; but at this very moment they were disquieted by fears lest their general's ambition might lead him to play the part of a second Cæsar. They resolved to engage him in an enterprise which would take him out of France. This undertaking was an attack upon England, which they were then meditating. Bonaparte opposed the plan of a direct descent upon the island as impracticable, declaring that England should be attacked through her Eastern possessions. He presented a scheme very characteristic of his bold, imaginative genius. This was nothing less than the conquest and colonization of Egypt, by which means France would be able to control the trade of the East and cut England off from her East India possessions. The Directors assented to the plan, and with feelings of relief saw Bonaparte embark from the port of Toulon to carry out the enterprise.

Evading the vigilance of the British fleet that was patrolling the Mediterranean, Bonaparte landed in Egypt (July 1, 1798). Within sight of the Pyramids the French army was checked in its march by a determined stand of the renowned Mameluke cavalry. Bonaparte animated the spirits of his men for the inevitable fight by one of his happiest speeches. One of the sentences is memorable. "Soldiers," he exclaimed, pointing to the Pyramids, "forty centuries are looking down upon you." The terrific struggle that followed is known in history as the "battle of the Pyramids." Bonaparte gained a victory that opened the way for his advance. Cairo was now entered in triumph, and all Lower Egypt fell into the hands of the French.

Bonaparte had barely made his entrance into Cairo before the startling intelligence was borne to him that his fleet had been destroyed in the bay of Abukir, at the mouth of the Nile, by the English admiral Nelson (August 1, 1798).

In the spring of 1799, the Ottoman Porte having sent a force to retake Egypt, Bonaparte led his army into Syria to fight the Turks there. He captured Gaza and Jaffa, and finally invested Acre. The Turks were assisted in the defense of this place by the distinguished English commodore, Sir Sidney Smith. All Bonaparte's efforts to carry the place by storm were in vain. "I missed my destiny at Acre," said Bonaparte afterwards. With the ports of Syria secured he might have imitated Alexander and led his soldiers to the foot of the Himalayas.

Bitterly disappointed, Bonaparte abandoned the siege of Acre and led his army back into Egypt. There his worn and thinned ranks were attacked near Abukir by a fresh Turkish army, but the genius of Bonaparte turned threatened defeat into a brilliant victory. Kléber, one of Bonaparte's lieutenants, clasping him in his arms, exclaimed, "General, how great you are!"

606. Establishment of the Tiberine, the Helvetic, and the Parthenopean Republics (1798–1799). — We must turn now to view affairs in Europe. The year 1798 was a favorable one for the republican cause represented by the Revolution. During that year and the opening month of the following one, the French set up three new republics.

First, they incited an insurrection at Rome, made a prisoner of the Pope, and proclaimed the Roman or Tiberine Republic. Then, intervening in a revolution in Switzerland, they invaded the Swiss cantons and united them into a commonwealth under the name of the Helvetic Republic. A little later the French troops drove the king of Naples out of Italy to Sicily, and transformed his peninsular domains into the Parthenopean Republic. Thus were three new republics added to the commonwealths which the Revolution had previously created.

607. The Reaction; Bonaparte overthrows the Directory (18th and 19th Brumaire, 1799). — Much of this work was quickly

undone. Encouraged by the victory of Nelson over the French fleet in the battle of the Nile, and alarmed at the aggressions of the government of the Directory, the leading powers of Europe, now including the Tsar of Russia, who was incensed against the French especially for their intrusion into the Orient, which the Russian rulers had ever regarded as their own particular sphere of influence, had formed a new coalition against France.

The war began early in 1799 and was waged at one and the same time in Italy, in Switzerland, and in Holland. In the south the campaign was extremely disastrous to the French. They were driven out of Italy, and were barely able to keep the allies off the soil of France. The Cisalpine, Tiberine, and Parthenopean republics were abolished.

These reverses suffered by the French armies in Italy, though in other quarters they had been successful, caused the Directory to fall into great disfavor. They were charged with having through jealousy exiled Bonaparte, the only man who could save the Republic. Confusion and division prevailed everywhere. The Royalists had become so strong and bold that there was danger lest they should gain control of the government. On the other hand, the threats of the mob of Paris began to create apprehensions of another Reign of Terror.

News of the desperate state of affairs at home reached Bonaparte in Egypt, just after his return from Syria. He instantly formed a bold resolve. Confiding the command of the army in Egypt to Kléber, he set sail for France, disclosing his designs in the significant words, "The reign of the lawyers is over."

Bonaparte was welcomed in France with the wildest enthusiasm. A great majority of the people felt instinctively that the emergency demanded a dictator. Some of the Directors joined with Napoleon in a plot to overthrow the government. Meeting with opposition in the Council of Five Hundred, Napoleon with a body of grenadiers drove the deputies from their chamber.

The French Revolution had at last brought forth its Cromwell (sec. 481). Napoleon was master of France. The first French Republic was at an end, and what is distinctively called the French

Revolution was over. Now commences the history of the Consulate and the First Empire, — the story of that surprising career the sun of which rose so brightly at Austerlitz and set forever at Waterloo.

Selections from the Sources. — YOUNG (ARTHUR), *Travels in France*, is the most valuable contemporary account we have of the condition of France, particularly of the peasantry, on the eve of the Revolution. BURKE, *Reflections on the Revolution in France. Translations and Reprints*, vol. i, No. 5, "The French Revolution, 1789–1791" (ed. by James Harvey Robinson), contains (1) "Decree of the National Assembly abolishing the Feudal System," (2) "Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen," and (3) "The Civil Constitution of the Clergy"; vol. iv, No. 5, "Typical Cahiers of 1789" (ed. by Merrick Whitcomb); and vol. vi, No. 1, "French Philosophers of the Eighteenth Century" (same editor). For additional material the special student should turn to ANDERSON, *The Constitutions and Other Select Documents Illustrative of the History of France, 1789–1901.*

Secondary Works. — For the antecedents and causes of the Revolution; TAINE, *The Ancient Régime*, and TOCQUEVILLE, *The Old Régime and the Revolution.* BUCKLE, *History of Civilization in England*, vol. i, chaps. xii–xiv, gives an unsurpassed presentation of the philosophical and literary movement of the eighteenth century. LOWELL, *The Eve of the Revolution;* a series of scholarly and suggestive studies of the various phases of French life and thought during the century preceding the calling of the States-General.

Short histories: STEPHENS, *Revolutionary Europe, 1789–1815*, first part. The most authoritative short history of the Revolution. Other excellent short accounts are MORRIS', MALLET'S, MATHEWS', and MIGNET'S.

Extended histories: STEPHENS, *A History of the French Revolution;* SYBEL, *History of the French Revolution;* THEIRS, *The History of the French Revolution;* TAINE, *The French Revolution; The Cambridge Modern History*, vol. viii; and CARLYLE, *The French Revolution.* The last is another of Carlyle's masterpieces; "a prose epic" and "pictures in the French Revolution" are good characterizations of it. The student should take it up last in his readings.

Biographies: MORLEY, *Rousseau* and *Voltaire;* WILLERT, *Mirabeau;* LAMARTINE, *History of the Girondists;* TARBELL, *Madame Roland;* SOUTHEY, *The Life of Nelson;* and ROCHETERIE, *The Life of Marie Antoinette.* For works on Napoleon Bonaparte, see bibliography at end of following chapter.

Work on special phase of the Revolution: MAHAN, *The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire*, vol. i.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The salt tax (the *gabelle*). 2. Rousseau. 3. The economist Turgot. 4. Mirabeau. 5. The Marseillaise hymn. 6. Thorvaldsen's "Lion of Lucerne." 7. Life in Paris during the Reign of Terror. See *Stephens.* 8. Marie Antoinette. 9. Madame Roland.

CHAPTER XXXIV

THE CONSULATE AND THE NAPOLEONIC EMPIRE (1799–1815)

I. The Consulate (1799–1804)

608. The Veiled Military Dictatorship. — After the overthrow of the government of the Directory, a new constitution — the fourth since the year 1789 — was prepared and, having been submitted to the approval of the people, was accepted by a vote of over three millions to less than two thousand. This new instrument vested the executive power in three Consuls, nominated for a term of ten years, the first of whom really exercised all the authority of the board, the remaining two members being simply his counselors. Bonaparte, of course, became the First Consul.

Fig. 93. — Napoleon Bonaparte. (After the medallion by *Isabey*)

The other functions of the government were carried on by a Council of State, a Tribunate, a Legislature, and a Senate. But the members of all these bodies were appointed either directly or indirectly by the Consuls, so that the entire government was actually in their hands, or rather in the hands of the First Consul. France was still called a republic, but it was such a republic

as Rome was under Julius Cæsar or Augustus. The republican names and forms merely veiled a government as absolute and personal as that of Louis XIV, — in a word, a military dictatorship.

Local self-government which had been created by the Revolution was suppressed. In all the various subdivisions of France the First Consul was represented by officials appointed by himself. The government became more centralized than it had ever been before, and this character it has retained up to the present time.

609. Causes of England's Hostility to Bonaparte. — Bonaparte inherited from the Directory war with Austria and England. To both he offered peace. Austria, which was asked to give up Lombardy, recently reconquered from the Republic, courteously declined his proposals. England, with rasping words, rejected the proffered hand of reconciliation.

There were several reasons for England's refusal to recognize the government of the First Consul. In the first place, the English minister Pitt declined to make peace with Bonaparte because he believed he represented the Jacobin element of the Revolution, and that his government would be violent and hence unstable. Again, judging from Bonaparte's acts as a general of the Directory, Pitt did not think that he could be trusted.

But the deeper motive of England's inextinguishable hostility to Bonaparte, not only as First Consul but also as Emperor, can be understood only as we view the Anglo-French phase of the wars of the Napoleonic era as a continuation of that second Hundred Years' War between France and England of which we gave some account in an earlier chapter (Chapter XXXI).

The seizure by France of the Austrian Netherlands — which gave her possession of Antwerp, the possible rival of London — and her intrusion into the Mediterranean alarmed England. A French empire dominating the European Continent and controlling the Mediterranean — Napoleon openly declared that "the Mediterranean was destined by nature to be a French lake" — was incompatible with England's commercial and trade supremacy in the world at large. In the Napoleonic wars England fought

to maintain that ascendancy which the wars of the eighteenth century with her great rival had secured for her.

610. War of the First Consul against Austria; Marengo and Hohenlinden; Peace of Lunéville (1801). — Offers of peace to Austria and England having been rejected, Bonaparte mustered his armies. His plan was to deal Austria, his only formidable Continental enemy, a double blow. A large army was collected on the Rhine for an invasion of Germany. This was intrusted to Moreau. Another, intended to operate against the Austrians in Italy, was gathered with great secrecy at the foot of the Alps. Bonaparte himself assumed command of this latter force.

In the spring of the year 1800 Bonaparte made his memorable passage of the Alps by the Great St. Bernard Pass, and astonished the Austrian generals by suddenly appearing in Piedmont at the head of an army of forty thousand men. Upon the renowned field of Marengo the Austrian army, which greatly outnumbered that of the French, was completely overwhelmed, and North Italy lay for a second time at the feet of Bonaparte. The Cisalpine Republic was now reëstablished.

But at the moment Italy was regained Egypt was lost. On the very day of the battle of Marengo, Kléber, whom Bonaparte had left in charge of the army in Egypt (sec. 607), was assassinated by a Mohammedan fanatic, and shortly afterwards the entire French force was obliged to surrender to the English.

The French reverses in Egypt, however, were soon made up by fresh victories in Europe. A few months after the battle of Marengo, Moreau gained a decisive victory over the Austrians at Hohenlinden, which opened the way to Vienna. The Emperor Francis II was now constrained to sign a treaty of peace at Lunéville (Feb. 9, 1801). The most important part of the treaty was that which provided for the reconstruction of the Germanic body. But as this reorganization of Central Europe was not completed until after the battle of Austerlitz, we shall defer further explanation of it until we reach that important event (sec. 620).

611. The Peace of Amiens with England (March 27, 1802). — The year following the peace between France and Austria,

England also signed the Peace of Amiens. In this treaty England acquiesced in the situation which France had created on the Continent, restored all the colonies (save the islands of Trinidad and Ceylon) which she had taken from France and her allies, — the Protestant Netherlands and Spain, — and agreed conditionally to withdraw from the island of Malta, which was one of the most important naval stations in the Mediterranean. France on her part agreed to withdraw her forces from Naples and the Papal States, and to recognize the independence of the Ionian Islands.[1]

All these provisions of the treaty show how largely commercial and colonial were the interests which had set the two rival nations in such mutual antagonism.

612. Bonaparte attempts to reëstablish the French Colonial Empire in the West. — Peace with England gave France the freedom of the sea and enabled the First Consul to pursue his favorite project at this time of the restoration of the French colonial empire in the West.

Bonaparte had already taken one important step towards this end. After his successful campaign against Austria in Italy he had taken the Grand Duchy of Tuscany from its Austrian prince, renamed it the Kingdom of Etruria, and given it to a Spanish Infante, in return for which Spain had ceded to France Louisiana in the New World (1800). Thus France was once more in possession of a large portion of the North American mainland.

By the Treaty of Amiens she had regained her island colonies in the West Indies. The western part of the important island of Haiti, however, which once belonged to France, had been lost during the Revolution by a successful revolt of the negroes and mulattoes against the whites.[2] In imitation of the motherland the self-emancipated blacks had set up a republic. Napoleon now sent an army of twenty thousand men to reconquer the island. The French troops were successful at first, but in the end the

[1] These islands had been taken from France by Russia and Turkey in 1798 and erected into an independent state under their joint guardianship.

[2] The leader of the revolt was the celebrated Toussaint Louverture, one of the most remarkable men ever produced by the black race.

CENTRAL EUROPE
1801
Scale of Miles.
0 50 100 200 300
German Empire
Austrian
Prussian
England and Hanover
Danish
Swedish
French
Sardinian
NORTH SEA
BALTIC SEA
ENGLAND
IRELAND
WALES
DENMARK
SWEDEN
PRUSSIA
RUSSIA
HOLSTEIN
BATAVIAN REPUBLIC
HANOVER
BRANDENBURG
SAXONY
SILESIA
NEW GALICIA
OLD GALICIA
BOHEMIA
AUSTRIA
HUNGARY
FRANCE
SPAIN
SWISS CONFEDERATION
HELVETIC REPUBLIC
CISALPINE REPUBLIC
LIGURIAN REPUBLIC
ADRIATIC SEA
CORSICA
SARDINIA
English Channel
BAY OF BISCAY
London
Amsterdam
Ghent
Brussels
Liege
Cologne
Bonlogne
Aix-la-Chapelle
Coblentz
Frankfurt
Prague
Cracow
Amiens
Varennes
Valmy
Treves
Worms
Mayence
Brest
Caen
Versailles
Paris
Metz
Spires
Strasbourg
Lunéville
Nantes
Besançon
Geneva
Bern
Lyon
Chambery
Milan
Rochefort
Bordeaux
Turin
Lodi
Marengo
Orange
Avignon
Marseille
Nice
Toulon
Andorra
Genoa
Lucca
Florence
S. Marino
Rome
Campo Formio
Venice
Hamburg
Bremen
Hanover
Berlin
Dresden
Breslau
Posen
Thorn
Warsaw
Danzig
Königsberg
Copenhagen
Lübeck
Rügen
Bornholm
Vienna
Buda
Pesth
Laoben
Salzburg
Hohenlinden
Würtemberg
Nassau
Baden
Parma
Modena
Ragusa
Cattaro
Montenegro
R. Rhine
R. Loire
R. Seine
R. Elbe
R. Vistula
R. Niemen
R. Danube
R. Drave
R. Save
R. Theiss

entire force was virtually destroyed by fever and the weapons of the blacks.

613. Bonaparte as an Enlightened Despot; the Regeneration of France; the Civil Code. — At this time were also begun by Bonaparte many of those domestic reforms and undertakings which were continued throughout the period of his domination, and which concerned almost every phase of the material, social, intellectual, religious, and civil life of France. It was his work here which constitutes his true title to fame. He was, in the words of his biographer Professor Sloane, "one of the greatest social reformers of the world."

We shall best understand Bonaparte in his rôle as a reformer, and best determine his place in history, if we regard him as the successor of the benevolent despots of the eighteenth century. His mission was to carry on and perfect their work and to consummate the reforms and to organize and make secure the social results of the Revolution.

To close the wounds inflicted upon France by the Revolution was one of the first aims of Bonaparte. Already the Royalist exiles had been invited to return. Forty thousand families came back, and many of the old supporters of the Bourbons now entered the service of the First Consul. The prison doors were thrown open. The past was forgotten and forgiven. There were no longer to be parties; all were to be simply Frenchmen. These wise measures of amnesty did much towards restoring confidence and bringing back internal peace and prosperity to France

But the deepest wound given France by the Revolution was the schism created by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (sec. 571). This had divided the nation into two bitterly opposed parties. Moreover, since 1794 the government had ceased to pay the salaries of the priests, with the result that many communes were wholly without regular religious services. To remedy this state of things Bonaparte entered into an agreement with the holy see known as the Concordat (July 15, 1801). The First Consul was to appoint archbishops and bishops impartially from both parties, that is, the party which had acquiesced in the revolutionary

programme and the party which had opposed it, and the state was again to assume as a public charge the salaries of the clergy.[3] The Pope was to be recognized as the head of the French Church, and was to confirm in their ecclesiastical offices the persons appointed by the government. The Concordat closed the great breach which the Revolution had opened in the French Church, and attached the Catholics to the government of the First Consul.

Not less successful was Bonaparte in his efforts to restore those material interests of the country which had suffered greatly during the Revolution. He repaired and constructed roads and bridges, dug canals, opened the rivers to navigation, and improved the seaports of the country. The great military roads which he caused to be constructed over the Alps are marvels of engineering skill, and served as a chief means of communication between Italy and the north of Europe until the mountains were pierced with tunnels.

The public buildings and monuments of France had fallen into decay. Bonaparte restored the old and built new ones. He embellished Paris and the other chief cities of France with public edifices and memorial monuments of every description. Many of these works are the pride of France at the present day.

Education was not neglected. By the establishment of schools and the endowment of libraries, museums, and art galleries, and by the creation finally of the University of France, Bonaparte gave an impulse to the educational system which is felt at the present time, and which has done much to secure for the French people the preëminent place they hold to-day in the world of art, science, and letters. It is to be borne in mind, however, that in this field the First Consul built upon foundations which had been laid by the Convention.

But the most noteworthy, the most enduring, and the most far-reaching in its influence upon civilization of all the works

[3] This arrangement held good for over one hundred years. The salaries of all the French clergy were paid out of the public treasury. In 1905, however, the relations between Church and State became very strained and in December resulted in the Separation Law which expressly abolished the Concordat and marked the final separation of Church and State in France.

of Napoleon Bonaparte, either as First Consul or as Emperor, was the compilation of what is known as the Civil Code, or Code Napoléon, which has caused his name to be joined with that of Justinian as one of the great lawgivers of history.

The compiling of this Code was one of the earliest undertakings of the First Consul. Almost immediately after coming to power he appointed a commission of five eminent jurists to take up the work, which had already been begun by the Constituent Assembly and the Convention.[4] These experts were busied with the labor for about four years (1800–1804). Bonaparte himself often met with them and assisted in the work by sagacious criticism and suggestion.

The Code was made up of the ancient customs of France, of Roman law maxims, and particularly of the principles and the legislation of the Revolution. This great mass of material was condensed, harmonized, and revised in some such way as the jurists of the Emperor Justinian handled the accumulated mass of law material — old and new, pagan and Christian — of their time, in the creation of the celebrated *Corpus Juris Civilis*.

The influence of the Civil Code upon the development of Liberalism in Western Europe was most salutary. It secured the work of the Revolution. It swept away the old unequal, iniquitous, oppressive customs, regulations, decrees, and laws that were an inheritance from the feudal ages. It recognized the equality of noble and peasant in the eye of the law. Either its principles or its direct provisions were soon introduced into half of the countries of Europe.

614. Bonaparte becomes Consul for Life (August, 1802); **Creation of the Legion of Honor.** — Through the Senate and the Council of State, in which bodies the majority of the members were wholly subservient to Bonaparte, it was now proposed to the French people that he should be made Consul for life, in order

[4] It is now recognized that the Code was not so novel a thing as some writers have represented it as being. Code making was a favorite work of the enlightened despots (e.g. Catherine the Great of Russia, the Emperor Joseph II of Austria, Frederick the Great of Prussia, etc.). The Civil Code is almost an exact transcript of the *Projet du code civil* prepared by Cambacérès for the Convention.

that his magnificent projects of restoration and reform might be pursued without interruption. With almost a single voice the people approved the proposal.[5] Thus did the First Consul move a step nearer the imperial throne. From this time on Bonaparte, imitating a royal custom, used only his first name, Napoleon, and it is by this name, which was destined to fill such a great place in history, that we shall hereafter know him.

It was at just this time that Napoleon established the Legion of Honor, an order designed to take the place of the old feudal orders which had been abolished by the Revolution. Preëminent public service, either in military or in civil life, was to be the passport to membership in the new society. The creation of this order gave offense to many of the more thoroughgoing republicans, who looked upon it as an ominous departure from the principle of social equality established by the Revolution.

615. Plot against Napoleon's Life; Execution of the Duke of Enghien (March 21, 1804). — The year following the conferring of these new powers and dignities upon Napoleon, a Royalist plot was laid for his assassination. The conspiracy was abetted by certain English officials,[6] war having been renewed between France and Great Britain. The plot was thwarted by timely discovery. The Duke of Enghien, a Bourbon prince in whose interest it was suspected the conspiracy had been formed, was, in gross violation of international law, seized by Napoleon's soldiers at Ettenheim, in Baden, carried to Vincennes, hastily condemned to death by a midnight military commission, and in the gray of the morning shot by the side of an open grave, — which had been dug before sentence was passed.

No act of Napoleon's has been more severely censured than this, for the young prince was very generally regarded as innocent of any participation in the plot. To say nothing of the lawlessness and criminality of the act, Napoleon could have

[5] There is a most extraordinary unanimity in the plebiscites, or popular votes, of this period. The present measure was carried by a vote, in round numbers, of 3,500,000 to 8000.

[6] See Rose, *Life of Napoleon*, vol. i, pp. 416–418.

done nothing more impolitic. It foreshadowed Waterloo. "Two actions," writes Chateaubriand in his *Memoirs*, "both bad, began and caused Napoleon's fall, — the death of the Duc d'Enghien and the war with Spain" (sec. 630).

The high-handed proceeding contributed to the calling into existence of a formidable coalition of the powers of Europe against Napoleon, of which we shall soon have occasion to speak.

II. The Napoleonic Empire (1804–1815); the War of Liberation

616. The Restoration of the Empire of Charlemagne (May 18, 1804). — The above conspiracy and the increased activity of the enemies of the First Consul resulted in a movement to increase his power and to insure his safety and the stability of his government by placing him upon a throne. Napoleon, while seeming to resign himself to the popular movement, really incited and directed it. A decree of the Senate conferring upon him the title of Emperor of the French having been submitted to the people for approval, was ratified by an almost unanimous vote.

The coronation took place in the cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris, Dec. 2, 1804, Pope Pius VII having been induced to come from Rome to take part in the ceremonies. The presence of the Pope was desired by Napoleon because it was his design to have himself regarded not as the successor of the Bourbons but as the successor of Charlemagne and the Cæsars, and it had always been thought necessary, by many at least, that the candidate for the imperial dignity should be consecrated to his office by the Roman pontiff. The Pope poured the holy oil upon the head of the kneeling Emperor and girded him with the imperial scepter; but when he would have placed the crown upon his head, Napoleon checked him, and, taking the diadem from the Pope, crowned himself with his own hands.

What portion of the spirit of the old divine-right monarchies entered into the new French Empire may be inferred from the doctrines which in less than a year after Napoleon's coronation

the subservient French clergy were teaching the youth of France. "The Emperor is the minister and the power of God, and his image on earth," ran the new catechism; "to honor and serve him is to honor and serve God."

617. The Republics created by the Revolution are changed into Kingdoms. — The French Republic was now completely metamorphosed into an unveiled Empire. Napoleon had taken up his residence in the palace of the Tuileries and was creating a court as much as possible like the court of the Bourbons.

The original Republic having been thus transformed, we may be sure that the cluster of republics which during the Revolution had been raised up around it will speedily undergo a like transformation; for Napoleon was right when he said that a revolution in France is sure to be followed by a revolution throughout Europe. As France a republic would make all states republics, so France a monarchy would make all nations monarchies. Within two years from the time that the French government assumed an imperial form, three of the surrounding republics raised up by the revolutionary ideas and armies of France had been transformed into states with monarchical governments dependent upon the French Empire or had been incorporated with France. In a word, all these states now became practically the fiefs of Napoleon's empire, the provinces and dependencies of a new Rome.

Thus the Cisalpine or Italian Republic was changed into a kingdom, and Napoleon, crowning himself at Milan with the "Iron Crown" of the Lombards,[7] assumed the government of the state, with the title of King of Italy (May, 1805). A little later in the same year the Emperor incorporated the Ligurian Republic with the French Empire (June, 1805). Then he remodeled the Batavian Republic into the kingdom of Holland and conferred the crown upon his favorite brother Louis (May, 1806).

Thus was the political work of the Revolution undone. Political liberty was taken away. "I set it aside," said Napoleon, "when it obstructed my road." Civil equality was left.

[7] Here again Napoleon imitated Charlemagne. He said, "I am Charlemagne, for like Charlemagne I unite the crowns of France and Lombardy." Compare sec. 74.

618. The Empire and the Old Monarchies. — It will not be supposed that the powers of Europe were looking quietly on while France was thus transforming herself and all the neighboring countries. The colossal power which the soldier of fortune was building up was a menace to all Europe. The Empire was more dreaded than the Republic, because it was a military despotism, and as such was an instrument of irresistible power in the hands of a man of such genius and resources as Napoleon. Coalition after coalition, of which England was "the paymaster," was formed by the sovereigns of Europe against the "usurper," with the object at first of pushing France back within her original boundaries, and then later of deposing Napoleon as the disturber of the peace of Europe and the oppressor of the nations.

From the coronation of Napoleon in 1804 until his final downfall in 1815 the tremendous struggle went on almost without intermission. It was the war of the giants. Europe was shaken from end to end with such armies as the world had not seen since the days of Xerxes. Napoleon, whose hands were upheld by a score of distinguished marshals, performed the miracles of genius. His brilliant achievements still dazzle, while they amaze, the world.

To relate in detail the campaigns of Napoleon from Austerlitz to Waterloo would require the space of volumes. We shall simply indicate in a few brief paragraphs the successive steps by which he mounted to the highest pitch of power and fame, and then trace hurriedly the decline and fall of his astonishing fortunes.

619. Napoleon's Preparations for invading England; the sale of Louisiana to the United States; the Camp at Boulogne (1803–1805). — Even while the transactions which we have recorded were taking place, the air was filled with notes of preparation for war. The Peace of Amiens between France and England (sec. 611) proved merely a short truce; even before Napoleon's coronation war had been renewed between the two countries.

One of Napoleon's first acts of preparation for the coming struggle was the sale (in 1803) to the United States, for fifteen million dollars, of the territory of Louisiana, which he had so

recently acquired from Spain (sec. 612). He was impelled to do this because his inferiority at sea made it impossible for him to defend such remote possessions.

The sale and purchase of this immense region of boundless resources, looked at in relation to its consequences, was one of the most important transactions in history. Napoleon's intuition seems to have revealed to him its significance for the development of the great American Republic. "I have given England a rival," he said, "which sooner or later will humble her pride."

As early as 1803 Napoleon had begun to mass a great army at Boulogne, on the English Channel, and to build an immense number of flat-bottomed boats preparatory to an invasion of England. "Carthage must be destroyed," was the menacing and persistent cry of the French press. "Masters of the Channel for six hours," said Napoleon, "and we are masters of the world." [8]

It is worth while in this connection to call to mind the fact that the American inventor, Robert Fulton, laid before Napoleon his invention of propelling vessels by steam at just the time when the Emperor was making his preparations for the invasion of England. Napoleon seems to have seen nothing in the invention. "Never," writes the contemporary Pasquier, "was he more badly served by his instincts. What might he not have been able to accomplish had he been the first to avail himself of this new means of reaching his most mortal enemy."

620. Campaign against Austria: Austerlitz (Dec. 2, 1805). — Napoleon's menacing preparations for the invasion of England produced throughout the island an alarm unequaled by anything the English people had experienced since the days of the Spanish Armada. The navy and the army were both put in a state of readiness to ward off the impending blow. The younger Pitt,

[8] It is one of the open questions of history whether Napoleon ever had any serious intention of making a descent upon England. In the opinion of many, all these elaborate preparations were simply designed by Napoleon as a cover under which he might, without exciting suspicion, raise and equip an army intended from the first to be used against a wholly different foe. It is Captain Mahan's opinion, however, that Napoleon really intended to strike a blow at London. See his *Life of Nelson* (Boston, 1897), vol. ii, chap. xx.

at this time head of the English government, was untiring in fostering a new coalition of the powers against France. Early in the year 1805 England and Russia formed an alliance which was intended to constitute the nucleus of a general European league. Austria and other states soon joined the coalition.

Intelligence reaching Napoleon that both the Austrian and the Russian armies were on the move, he suddenly broke up the camp at Boulogne, flung his Grand Army, as it was called, across the Rhine, outmaneuvered and captured a great Austrian army at Ulm, and then marched in triumph through Vienna to the field of Austerlitz beyond, where he gained one of his most memorable victories over the combined armies of Austria and Russia, numbering more than eighty thousand men. Austria was now shorn of large tracts of her dominions,[9] including Venetia, which Napoleon added to the kingdom of Italy.



FIG. 94. — WILLIAM PITT, SON OF WILLIAM PITT, EARL OF CHATHAM (After a painting by *Thomas Gainsborough*)

621. The Reorganization of Germany; the Confederation of the Rhine; End of the Holy Roman Empire (1806). — That reconstruction of the Germanic body which Napoleon had begun after the battles of Marengo and Hohenlinden (sec. 610) was now substantially completed, save as regards Prussia and Hanover. Napoleon's guiding principle here was to create in Western Germany a small number of states which should be bound to himself by selfish interests and strong enough to be useful as allies, and which should constitute barrier states between France on the one side and Austria and Prussia on the other. Both of these latter states were to be kept weak and dependent upon France.

[9] The Treaty of Pressburg (Dec. 26, 1805) arranged affairs between Austria and France.

In pursuance of this plan Napoleon ultimately reduced the three hundred and more states comprising the Germanic system to about forty. It was the ecclesiastical states, the free imperial cities, and the petty states of the minor princes which suffered extinction, their lands being bestowed upon the princes of the states selected for survival. Among the rulers especially favored at this time were the Elector of Bavaria and the Duke of Würtemberg, both of whom were made kings and given enough territory to enable them to maintain becomingly this new dignity. The Margrave of Baden was also made a grand duke, and his dominions were enlarged. All these princes formed marriage alliances with the family of Napoleon.

These favored states, together with others, — sixteen in all, — now declared themselves independent of the old Holy Roman Empire, and were formed into a league called the Confederation of the Rhine, with Napoleon as Protector[10] (July 12, 1806).

Napoleon now absolved the feudatories of the Holy Roman Empire from their allegiance to the imperial crown. This action, taken in connection with the withdrawal of the Rhenish states, effected the complete break-up of the ancient Empire. Emperor Francis II, recognizing that his office was virtually abolished, now laid down the imperial crown (August 6, 1806), and henceforth used as his highest title *Francis I, Emperor of Austria*.[11]

Thus did the Holy Roman Empire come to an end, after having maintained an existence, since its revival under Charlemagne, of almost exactly one thousand years. Reckoning from its establishment by Cæsar Augustus, it had lasted over eighteen hundred years, thus being one of the longest-lived of human institutions, — if mere existence may be reckoned as life.

622. Good Results of Napoleon's Reorganization of Germany. — Napoleon's reorganization of the Germanic body, arbitrary and personal though his action was, proved ultimately of great import

[10] The Confederation came ultimately to embrace thirty-seven states, with a population of about fifteen millions.

[11] He had already assumed this title in August, 1804, just after Napoleon's coronation as Emperor.

to the German folk. It marked the beginning of the remarkable development of the German Empire. Out of the new German system which Napoleon created was to rise the later German Empire. Hence we may regard Napoleon's reconstruction of Central Europe as one of the most important, in its far-reaching consequences, of all his acts.

An immediate benefit conferred upon the states of the Confederation of the Rhine was the introduction into them of all the reforms which had regenerated France and made her strong. Serfdom was abolished where it still lingered; equality of the noble and the non-noble classes before the law was established; and the new French Civil Code was partly put in force. This meant the broadening and the carrying out of the work begun, and in part accomplished, in some of these German states by the benevolent despots of the eighteenth century.

623. **Trafalgar** (Oct. 21, 1805). — Napoleon's brilliant victories in Germany were clouded by an irretrievable disaster to his fleet, which occurred on the day following the surrender of the Austrians at Ulm. Lord Nelson having met, near Cape Trafalgar on the coast of Spain, the combined French and Spanish fleets, — Spain was at this time Napoleon's ally, — almost completely destroyed the combined armaments. The gallant English admiral fell at the moment of victory.

This decisive battle gave England the control of the sea and relieved her from all danger of a French invasion. Even the "wet ditch," as Napoleon was wont contemptuously to call the English Channel, was henceforth an impassable gulf to his ambition. He might rule the Continent, but the sovereignty of the ocean and its islands was denied him.

624. **Campaign against Prussia: Jena and Auerstädt** (1806). — Prussia was the next state after Austria to feel the weight of Napoleon's hand. King Frederick William III, following the dictates of selfish prudence, had thus far held aloof from the coalitions against Napoleon, and had profited greatly by such a policy. He had remained inactive while Austria was being beaten to the ground; but realizing at last the perfidious character of the man

with whom he was dealing, and goaded by insufferable insult, he recklessly threw down the gauntlet to the victor of Austerlitz.

Moving with his usual swiftness, Napoleon overwhelmed the Prussian armies in the battles of Jena and Auerstädt, which were both fought on the same day (Oct. 14, 1806). The greater part of Prussia was now quickly overrun by the French armies. The Prussian generals, at least most of them, exhibited the most incredible incapacity and cowardice. Strong fortresses were surrendered without a blow being struck in their defense. The capital, Berlin, was entered by the French in triumph.

The sword of the great Frederick, the famous car of victory over the Brandenburg Gate at Berlin, together with many treasures stolen from the museums and art galleries of the city, were carried as trophies to Paris.

625. Campaigns against the Russians: Eylau and Friedland (1807). — The Russian army, which the Tsar Alexander had sent to the aid of Frederick William, was still in the field against Napoleon in the Prussian territories east of the Vistula.

Early in the year 1807 Napoleon attacked, on a stormy winter day, the Russian forces at Eylau. The battle was sanguinary and indecisive, each army, it is estimated, leaving over thirty thousand dead and wounded on the snow. During the summer campaign of the same year Napoleon again engaged the Russians in the terrible battle of Friedland and completely overwhelmed them. The Tsar was constrained to sue for peace.

626. The Treaty of Tilsit (July 7, 1807); **the Partition of the World.** — Napoleon arranged a series of interviews with the Tsar Alexander at Tilsit. The first of the meetings took place on a raft moored midway in the Niemen, the frontier river of Russia.

These interviews between Napoleon and Alexander mark one of the most dramatic situations in European history. The old order of things had been destroyed and a new order of things was being projected. The subject of converse of the two emperors was nothing less than the partition of the world between them. "Napoleon spread before the eyes of the Emperor of Russia his favorite conception of the reëstablishment of the old empires of

the East and the West. They were to be faithful allies. France was to be the supreme power over the Latin races and in the center of Europe; Russia was to represent the Greek Empire and to expand into Asia. These grandiose views charmed the Emperor Alexander, who believed that in adopting them he was following out the policy of Peter the Great and of the Empress Catherine. The one enemy to be feared and crushed, according to Napoleon, was England." [12]

Thus the modern world was to be made over on the old Romano-Byzantine model. All the special understandings arrived at by the two emperors looked to the realization of this magnificent conception. Several states were marked out for dismemberment or extinction. Russia had already absorbed the greater part of Poland. The Tsar Alexander was now encouraged by Napoleon to take Finland from Sweden and the Danubian provinces from Turkey. Napoleon promised to aid him in carrying out this part of the programme. In return the Tsar agreed to close the ports of Russia against English goods and to cede to France the Ionian Isles.[13]

As regards Poland and Prussia the interests of the two emperors clashed. It would have been to the advantage of Napoleon to restore the dismembered Polish nation, but he could not do this without alienating the Tsar Alexander; so he merely organized the greater part of Prussian Poland — he gave a portion of it to the Tsar — into what he named the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, and bestowed it upon the vassal king of Saxony.[14]

Thus were the hopes of the Polish patriots sacrificed upon the altar of Napoleon's imperial ambitions. Here was a nation of fifteen million souls which had been partitioned by brigand kings like a herd of cattle. The patriot Poles, who with pathetic devotion had followed Napoleon to every battlefield of the Consulate and the Empire, looked to him to unite and restore their nation. He had allowed them to hope that he would do so. Never were

[12] Stephens, *Revolutionary Europe, 1789–1815*, p. 249.

[13] See sec. 611, n. 1.

[14] Napoleon had made the Elector of Saxony a king just after the battle of Jena.

hopes more cruelly disappointed. Had Napoleon here acted the part of a real liberator, he would have undone one of the greatest wrongs of which history knows, and in the gratitude of a redeemed and valiant nation would have raised for himself an enduring monument as one of the greatest benefactors of humanity.

As to Prussia, Napoleon was minded to erase it from the map of Europe. The intercession of the Tsar Alexander, however, saved the state from total extinction.[15] But neither the Tsar's mediation in behalf of his ally, Frederick William III, nor the personal entreaties of the beautiful and patriotic Queen Louisa, who humiliated herself by appearing as a suppliant before Napoleon at Tilsit, availed to save the monarchy from dismemberment and the deepest abasement.

Besides stripping Prussia of her Polish provinces Napoleon took away from her all her territories west of the Elbe, out of which, in connection with some other lands, he made the new kingdom of Westphalia, and gave it to his brother Jerome. This kingdom, into the making of which went twenty-four principalities and free cities, Napoleon now added to the Confederation of the Rhine.

Prussia thus lost fully one half of her territory. What was left became virtually a province of Napoleon's empire. The mutilated and exhausted state was forced to pay an enormous war indemnity, which finally mounted up to a thousand million francs, to meet the cost of a great French army of occupation and to furnish a contingent for the French army whenever called upon by Napoleon to do so.

627. **The Continental Blockade; the Berlin and Milan Decrees** (1806–1807). — After the Peace of Tilsit, England was Napoleon's sole remaining enemy. The means which he employed to compass the ruin of this formidable and obstinate foe, the paymaster of the coalitions which he was having constantly to face, affords the key to the history of the great years from 1807 to the

[15] Alexander wished to maintain Prussia as a barrier state between Russia and Napoleon's empire. He viewed with apprehension the advance of Napoleon's frontier towards the western boundary of his own domains.

final downfall of Napoleon at Waterloo in 1815. These means were what is known as the Continental Blockade or System. A very brief retrospect will make the situation clear.

We have seen how the English Admiral Nelson destroyed the allied French and Spanish fleets at Trafalgar (sec. 623). The effect of this victory upon European history can hardly be exaggerated. "Trafalgar was not only the greatest naval victory, it was the greatest and most momentous victory won either by land or by sea during the whole of the revolutionary war. No victory, and no series of victories, of Napoleon produced the same effect upon Europe. . . . The prospect of crushing the British navy, so long as England had the means to equip a navy, vanished. Napoleon henceforth set his hopes on exhausting England's resources, by compelling every state on the Continent to exclude her commerce. Trafalgar forced him to impose his yoke upon *all* Europe, or to abandon the hope of conquering Great Britain. . . . Nelson's last triumph left England in such a position that no means remained to injure her but those which *must result in the ultimate deliverance of the Continent.*"[16]

As we have just intimated, the history of the remaining years of Napoleon's domination is hardly more than a commentary upon these words.

Alleging violations by England of the law of nations respecting the trade of neutrals and the right of blockade, Napoleon by two celebrated edicts, called from the cities whence they were issued the Berlin and Milan decrees, closed all the ports of the Continent against English ships, and forbade any of the European nations from holding any intercourse with Great Britain, all of whose ports he declared to be in a state of blockade. All ships engaging in trade with her were made subject to capture. All English subjects wherever found were to be made prisoners of war and their property confiscated.[17]

[16] Fyffe, *History of Modern Europe*, vol. i, p. 28; quoted by Mahan, *The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire*, vol ii, p. 196.

[17] England replied to these decrees by so-called Orders in Council (Jan. 7, 1807, and Nov. 11, 1807), whereby vessels trading between ports from which Napoleon had excluded English ships were made subject to capture as lawful war prizes.

The policy thus adopted by Napoleon to ruin England was a suicidal one, and resulted finally in the ruin of his own empire. English traders indeed suffered some severe losses, while the retaliatory measures adopted by the English government contributed to involve it in an unfortunate war with the United States;[18] yet on the whole England was rather benefited than injured by the Continental System, for since Napoleon was practically without a navy, the blockade could not be made effective, and immense quantities of English goods were smuggled into the continental ports and sold at high prices. Even Napoleon's own soldiers were sometimes clad in English-made clothes and shod with English-made shoes.

On the other hand, the effect upon the trade and commerce of the continental states was simply ruinous. Every trading center seethed with suppressed anger. "The hurling of twenty kings from their thrones," writes Napoleon's secretary, Bourrienne, "would have produced less hatred."

628. **The English seize the Danish Fleet** (September, 1807). — Events of great moment, all connected directly with Napoleon's Continental Blockade, now tread closely one upon the heels of another.

A part of the understanding between Napoleon and Alexander at Tilsit was that Napoleon should seize upon Denmark and Portugal and appropriate their fleets, in order that he might be able to carry on more effectively his commercial war with Great Britain. In this contemplated action no regard was paid to the fact that both these countries were neutral states.

The English ministers got information respecting this secret article of the Tilsit treaty. The situation in the North was already serious for the English. The Directory in taking possession of the Dutch Netherlands had got control of the Dutch trade. Napoleon's campaign against Prussia had resulted in his getting actual or virtual possession of all the ports of North Germany. Should he now be allowed to seize Denmark he would be able to control absolutely the commerce of the Baltic Sea.

[18] The War of 1812–1814.

The English government resolved to forestall Napoleon by seizing the Danish fleet. An English squadron descended upon the Danish capital, Copenhagen, and demanded of the astonished Danes the surrender of all their ships and naval stores. It was explained by the English officials that the fleet and stores would be held by England merely as a "deposit," and would be given back at the end of the war with France.

The Danes indignantly refused to give up their ships. Thereupon the English bombarded Copenhagen, destroying over eighteen hundred of the houses of the city, and quickly compelled compliance with their demand. The entire Danish fleet, and all the naval stores which could be found, were carried off by the English as war booty. The proceeding was admittedly a high-handed one, and probably England lost more by it than she gained; for it aroused against her a feeling of bitter indignation on the Continent, and caused Denmark, hitherto neutral, to enter into a close alliance with Napoleon.

629. Napoleon takes possession of Portugal (November, 1807). — The English had foiled Napoleon in his designs upon the Danish fleet. They also marred his plans concerning Portugal. Shortly after the Danish affair, he sent an army under the command of Junot into the peninsula. Upon the approach of the French army to Lisbon the royal family, acting upon the advice of the English government, embarked on board the Portuguese fleet and, escorted by several English war ships, sailed for Brazil.

Thus the fleet was got out of Napoleon's reach, but the country passed into the hands of the French. A proclamation by Junot declared that "the House of Braganza had ceased to rule," and Portugal now became virtually a province of Napoleon's empire.

630. Napoleon places his Brother Joseph upon the Spanish Throne (June 6, 1808); **the Spanish Uprising.** — The seizure of Portugal was only the first step in the carrying out by Napoleon of his scheme for making himself master of the whole of the Iberian peninsula. Spain was next appropriated.

Arrogantly interfering in the affairs of that country, — the government it must be said was desperately incompetent and

corrupt, and the condition of things in the royal family most disgraceful, — Napoleon induced the weak-minded Bourbon king, Charles IV, to resign to him as "his dearly beloved friend and ally" his crown, which he at once bestowed upon his brother Joseph (June 6, 1808). The throne of Naples, which Joseph had been occupying,[19] was transferred to Murat, Napoleon's brother-in-law. Thus did this audacious man make and unmake kings, and give away thrones and kingdoms.

But the high-spirited Spaniards were not the people to submit tamely to such an indignity as Napoleon had inflicted upon them. The entire nation from the Pyrenees to the Straits of Gibraltar flew to arms. The uprising had world-wide significance. "The effect produced by Spanish enthusiasm in all its reckless wildness was incalculable, and makes this rebellion stand out as the greatest European event which had happened since the French Revolution, and the beginning of a new and grand chapter in European history."[20]

Portugal also rose, and England sent to her aid a force under Sir Arthur Wellesley, afterwards Duke of Wellington, and the hero of Waterloo. In Spain as in Portugal humiliating disasters, like an avenging Nemesis, overtook the French. In Southern Spain an army of over twenty thousand was forced to surrender to the Spaniards.[21] This made necessary the abandonment of Madrid by the French. Joseph fled in dismay from his throne before he had been seated upon it more than eight days. The French retreated beyond the Ebro, almost to the foot of the Pyrenees. In Portugal fate was equally adverse to them. After a serious defeat at the hands of the English, Junot signed an agreement according to the terms of which the French were to evacuate Portugal, the English agreeing to carry them home by sea.

Napoleon, aside from his unfortunate expedition to Egypt, had never before met with such a check. The warning words of his brother Joseph, who had written him, "Your glory will suffer

[19] Napoleon had dethroned the Bourbons in Naples in 1806.

[20] Seeley, *Life and Times of Stein*, vol. i, p. 346.

[21] This was the memorable capitulation of Baylen (July 20, 1808).

shipwreck in Spain," seemed to have found quick fulfillment. Napoleon realized that he must take the field himself if the prestige of the French arms was to be restored.

631. **The Congress at Erfurt** (September–October, 1808). — Before setting out on this enterprise, however, Napoleon deemed it politic to have an interview with the Tsar Alexander, in order to renew the friendship and cement afresh the alliance entered into between them at Tilsit, — for he was well aware that the Tsar was chafing under the workings of the Continental Blockade.

The meeting took place at Erfurt. This celebrated Congress marks the culminating point of Napoleon's extraordinary career. Europe probably had never seen anything in imperial magnificence, in civil and military display, to equal this gathering. Napoleon on this occasion played host to four vassal kings, to scores of princes and ambassadors, and to the greatest poets and men of letters of the time. French actors, brought from Paris, presented night after night to "a parterre of kings" the masterpieces of the French stage.

The obsequiousness of all, in particular of the petty German princes, to Napoleon is what most amazes us. The meeting between Napoleon and Goethe and Wieland possesses a painful interest. Both of the great poets seemed dazzled by the genius of the conqueror of Europe, and bowed in homage at his feet. Goethe was flattered when Napoleon greeted him with the words, "You are a man"; and both accepted at his hands the cross of the Legion of Honor.[22]

Amidst festivals, parades, balls, and operas the main purpose of the meeting was not forgotten by Napoleon. The Tilsit alliance between him and the Russian Emperor was renewed. In return for being allowed to absorb Finland — Alexander had at this time nearly completed the conquest of that province — and to appropriate the Danubian provinces of the Sultan, the Tsar

[22] Of course, in judging the conduct of the German princes and German men of letters at this Erfurt meeting, we should bear in mind how weak at this time the sentiment of nationality among the Germans really was. For the attitude of Goethe and other German thinkers towards nationalism, see sec. 640, n. 26.

was to keep Austria quiet while Napoleon was busy in Spain, and was to rigorously enforce the blockade against England.

632. Napoleon in Spain (November, 1808–January, 1809). — From the Congress at Erfurt Napoleon hastened into Spain. At the head of an army of over a hundred thousand men he marched southward, entered Madrid in triumph, reseated his brother upon the Spanish throne, and then told the Spaniards that if they did not respect Joseph he would put the crown on his own head and teach them what was becoming conduct in subjects.

Napoleon now began the pursuit of a British army which under Sir John Moore had marched from Portugal into Spain. Threatening tidings from another quarter of Europe caused him to give over the pursuit into the hands of one of his marshals,[23] while he himself hastened back to Paris.

633. Napoleon's Third Campaign against Austria (1809). — Taking advantage of Napoleon's troubles in the Iberian peninsula, Emperor Francis I of Austria had put his army on a war footing, and was making ready to throw down the gage of battle.

Napoleon, since his best troops were occupied in Spain, sincerely desired peace with Austria. But the Emperor Francis was bent on war, his hopes of regaining what had been lost apparently rendering him forgetful of Austerlitz. "The waters of Lethe and not the waters of the Danube," said Napoleon to a group of foreign ambassadors, "seem to wash the walls of Vienna."

The war opened in the spring of 1809. At the end of a short campaign, the most noted engagements of which were the hard-fought battles of Aspern (Essling) and Wagram, Austria was again at Napoleon's feet.

The Emperor Francis was now forced to cede large tracts of his dominions to Bavaria and to the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, and to surrender to Napoleon Carniola, Istria, and other lands. These last, together with certain cessions made by Austria in

[23] The retreat of Sir John Moore from the heart of Spain before a greatly superior French force is given a place along with that of the Ten Thousand Greeks among the memorable retreats in history. Moore was killed in the battle of Corunna (Jan. 16, 1809), on the northern coast of Spain, and the remnant of his army, which his skill and gallantry had saved, were taken on board the English fleet.

1805, Napoleon added to his empire under the name of the Illyrian Provinces.

The cession by Austria of her Illyrian lands deprived her of her water front on the Adriatic Sea and shut her out from the Mediterranean. At the same time these lands were a valuable acquisition for Napoleon. He now had actual or virtual control of the whole of the European coast line from the frontier of Turkey on the Adriatic to the frontier of Russia on the Baltic.

634. **Union of the Papal States with Napoleon's Empire** (May, 1809). — Napoleon's Continental System had led him into deep trouble in the Iberian peninsula. It now contributed to bring him into trouble with the Papacy. Pope Pius VII refused to enforce the blockade against England and further presumed to disregard other commands of Napoleon. Thereupon Napoleon declared that the Pope "was no longer a secular prince," and took possession of his domains. Pope Pius straightway excommunicated the Emperor, who thereupon arrested him, and for three years held him a state prisoner. He further removed the College of Cardinals to Paris. Thither he also transferred all the chief officers of the papal government, together with the papal archives. Hundreds of wagonloads of books and documents were dragged to the French capital.

Napoleon's idea in all this was to get the entire machinery of the papal government under his hand. He had in mind to preside over the councils of the Church as Constantine and Charlemagne had done. After his fall he commented as follows upon this part of his plan for setting up a universal autocracy: "Paris would have become the capital of Christendom, and I should have governed the religious as well as the political world."

635. **Napoleon's Second Marriage** (1810). — Soon after his triumph over the Emperor Francis, Napoleon divorced his wife Josephine in order to form a new alliance with the Archduchess Marie Louise of Austria.[24] Josephine bowed meekly to the will of

[24] Josephine was divorced Dec. 15, 1809; the marriage to Marie-Louise took place April 2, 1810. Josephine retained her title of Empress, and was assigned the palace of Malmaison as a residence with a pension of two million francs a year. To the very last she and Napoleon were good friends. Her death occurred May 29, 1814.

her lord and went into sorrowful exile from his palace. Napoleon's object in this matter was to cover the reproach of his plebeian birth by an alliance with one of the ancient royal families of Europe, and to secure the perpetuity of his government by leaving an heir to be the inheritor of his throne and fortunes.

The desire and ambition of Napoleon to found a dynasty seemed realized when, the year following his marriage with the archduchess, a son was born to them, who was given the title of King of Rome. His enemies could now no longer, as he reproached them with doing, make appointments at his grave. He had now something more than "a life interest" in France. The succession was assured.

In forming this family alliance with Napoleon, the conqueror and oppressor of Germany, the Emperor Francis undermined his position as German leader in the coming War of Liberation and left the way clear for Prussia to assume that place of venture and of honor.

636. Holland and North German Coast Lands annexed to Napoleon's Empire (1810). — During this year of his second marriage Napoleon made two fresh territorial additions to his empire.

Louis Bonaparte, — king of Holland, it will be recalled, — disapproving of his brother's Continental System, which was ruining the trade of the Dutch, abdicated the crown. Thereupon Napoleon incorporated Holland with the French Empire (July 9, 1810).

A few months later Napoleon also annexed to his empire all the German coast land from Holland to Lübeck in order to be able to close the important ports here, including the old Hanseatic cities of Bremen, Hamburg, and Lübeck, against English trade.

637. Napoleon's Empire at its Greatest Extent (1811). — In these additions the Napoleonic empire received its last enlargement. Napoleon was now, in outward seeming,[25] at the height of his marvelous fortunes. Marengo, Austerlitz, Jena, Friedland, and Wagram were the successive steps by which he had mounted to the most dizzy heights of military power and glory.

[25] It is probably true that the height of Napoleon's real power is marked by the Treaty of Tilsit (1807).

CENTRAL EUROPE
1810
0 50 100 150 200 250 300 350
Scale of Miles.
French Empire and Dependent States
Austrian
Prussian
Swedish
Savoyard
IRELAND
ENGLAND
WALES
London
Amsterdam
Hague
HOLLAND
Boulogne
Brussels
Waterloo
Cologne
Aix la Chapelle
Rouen
Paris
Fontainbleau
Nantes
Napoleon Vendée
Bordeaux
Toulouse
St. Sebastian
SPAIN
Mayence
Treves
Metz
Strasbourg
Lyon
Geneva
Turin
Milan
Genoa
Marseilles
Nice
CORSICA
Rome
Naples
KM. OF SARDINIA
KM. OF NAPLES
KM. OF ITALY
FRENCH EMPIRE
HELVETIC REPUBLIC
BAVARIA
BADEN
WURTEMBURG
CONFEDERATION of the RHINE
WESTPHALIA
Hamburg
Lübeck
MECKLENBURG
DENMARK
Copenhagen
BALTIC SEA
RUGEN
POMERANIA
PRUSSIA
Berlin
Leipzig
Erfurt
Jena
Dresden
SAXONY
SILESIA
Breslau
Cracow
GALICIA
DY. OF WARSAW
Warsaw
Königsberg
Danzig
Memel
Friedland
Tilsit
Eylau
RUSSIA
Prague
BOHEMIA
Austerlitz
Wagram
Vienna
AUSTRIA
AUSTRIAN EMPIRE
HUNGARY
Pesth
Danube
Drave
SLAVONIA
ILLYRIAN PROVINCES
Venice
BOSNIA
SERVIA
OTTOMAN EMPIRE
MONTENEGRO
R. Elbe
R. Rhine
R. Loire
R. Seine
R. Po
R. Niemen
R. Vistula
R. Bug

The empire which this soldier of fortune had built up stretched from Lübeck to beyond Rome, embracing France proper, the Netherlands, part of Western and Northwestern Germany, all Western Italy as far south as the kingdom of Naples, together with the Illyrian Provinces and the Ionian Islands.

On all sides were allied, vassal, or dependent states. Several of the ancient thrones of Europe were occupied by Napoleon's relatives or his favorite marshals. He himself was king of the kingdom of Italy, Protector of the Confederation of the Rhine, and Mediator of Switzerland. Austria and Prussia were completely subject to his will. Russia and Denmark were his allies.

Such were the relations of the once great powers and independent states of Europe to "the Corsican adventurer." Not since the time of the Cæsars had one man's will swayed so much of the civilized world.

638. Elements of Weakness in the Empire. — But, splendid and imposing as at this moment appeared the external affairs of Napoleon, the sun of his fortunes, which had risen so brightly at Austerlitz, had already passed its meridian. There were many things just now contributing to the weakness of Napoleon's empire and foreboding its speedy dissolution. Founded and upheld by the genius of this single man, it depended solely upon his life and fortunes. The diverse elements it embraced were as yet so loosely joined that there could be no good hope that it would survive either the misfortune or the death of its founder.

Again, Napoleon's Continental System, through the suffering and loss it inflicted particularly upon the maritime countries of Europe, had caused murmurs of discontent all around the circumference of the Continent.

Still again, the conscriptions of the Emperor had drained France of men, and her armies were now recruited by mere boys, who were utterly unfit to bear the burden and fatigue of Napoleon's rapid campaigns. The heavy taxes, also, which were necessary to meet the expenses of Napoleon's wars, and to carry on the splendid public works upon which he was constantly engaged, produced great suffering and discontent throughout the empire.

Furthermore, Napoleon's harsh and unjust treatment of Pope Pius VII had alienated the Catholic clergy and created a resentful feeling among pious Catholics everywhere.

At the same time the crowd of deposed princes and dispossessed aristocrats in those states which Napoleon had reconstructed, and in which he had set up the new code of equal rights, were naturally resentful, and were ever watching an opportunity to regain their lost power and privileges.

Even the large class who at first welcomed Napoleon as the representative of the French ideas of equality and liberty, and applauded while he overturned ancient thrones and stripped of their privileges ancient aristocracies, — even many of these early adherents had been turned into bitter enemies by his adoption of imperial manners and the formation of a court, by his violation of the principle of equality through the creation of an hereditary aristocracy, and especially by his setting aside his first wife, Josephine, and forming a marriage alliance with one of the old hated royal houses of Europe.

639. The New Force destined to destroy Napoleon's Empire: the Nations. — But the active force which was to overwhelm Napoleon's empire and to free Europe from his tyranny was the sentiment of national patriotism which was being aroused in the dismembered and vassal states, and in those threatened with the loss of independence. Up to the time of his invasion of Spain, Napoleon had warred against the governments of Europe. Those governments he had been able to overturn easily because they were not based on the love and loyalty of their subjects.

But now Napoleon, in his ambition to make himself master of all Europe, was contemptuously disregarding the claims of race and nationality. The Empire threatened to become the tomb of the Nations. In the face of this danger national patriotism was being everywhere awakened.

After the surrender of Ulm, when Austria was for the second time beaten to the ground by Napoleon, the English minister Pitt said to some desponding friends, who expressed the opinion that the French Emperor could never be resisted on land, that

"Napoleon would meet with a check when he encountered a *national* resistance; and that Spain was the place for it; and that then England would intervene." Commenting upon this prophecy, Lord Acton pronounces it "the most astounding and profound prediction in all political history, where such things have not been rare."

We have witnessed the popular uprising in Spain; we shall now witness a similar movement in North Germany and in Russia.

640. The Regeneration of Prussia; Stein, Hardenberg, and Scharnhorst. — It was in Prussia that this movement for a *national* life had its greatest response. After the crushing defeat at Jena Prussia passed completely under the power of Napoleon. The very fact that through such a military defeat they had become the subjects of their former enemy did more than any other single event to call into life the long-dormant sentiment of national patriotism among the Germans. The growth of this new feeling was stimulated and directed by various agencies.

Foremost among these agencies were the stirring patriotic songs of the poets Arndt, Körner, and others, which kindled in thousands a hitherto unwonted fervor of enthusiasm for their country. Schiller, also, in his plays, especially *William Tell* and *The Maid of Orleans*, aroused a new martial spirit and a new sense of national honor.

Education became another of the means of national quickening and regeneration. In the year 1808, while Napoleon's garrisons held all the chief fortresses of Prussia and his spies and informers made dangerous any utterance adverse to his rule, the philosopher Fichte delivered before Berlin audiences a remarkable course of lectures entitled "Addresses to the German Nation." No such appeal had been made to the German mind and heart since Luther published his "Address to the German Nobility" (sec. 324).

Fichte's idea was that public education was the only hopeful agency for the moral and political regeneration of the German nation. The German youth must be taught the duty of unselfish devotion to the public welfare, and must be made to realize the joy of making sacrifices for his country. Thus was a wholly new

spirit breathed into German education and German philosophy.[26] Thousands of German youths were stirred by a sentiment they had never felt before, — an ardent love for their country and its name.

At the same time that the poets, philosophers, and teachers were creating by their appeals and methods a new spirit in Prussian society, the masses of the people were being reached and awakened by the social and economic reforms carried out by the two eminent statesmen, Stein and Hardenberg.[27]



FIG. 95. — BARON VOM STEIN (From an engraving by *W. Roffe*)

Two thirds of the population of Prussia were at this time serfs. Now, Stein's controlling idea was that the strength of a state depends upon the patriotism of the people; but his insight revealed to him the truth that "patriots cannot be made out of serfs." Hence his policy of enfranchisement.

By a celebrated Edict of Emancipation serfdom was abolished. The peasant was no longer the hereditary subject of a landlord, but could work for any employer and could even hope to acquire a piece of land as his own. Thus the economic development of Prussia became possible. The Prussian king, in the words of Stein, was no longer "the king of slaves, but of free men." This

[26] Hitherto the greatest thinkers and writers of Germany had insisted that the individual seek culture simply for his own sake. The state was the thing of last concern with the great poet Goethe. National patriotism he regarded as a narrow sentiment unworthy of a great mind. The poet Lessing declared patriotism to be "a heroic weakness," and love of fatherland a sentiment which he had never felt. Equally free from this "heroic weakness," as related to a *German* fatherland, was the philosopher Hegel. The idea with all these great poets and philosophers was that Cosmopolitanism is a nobler thing than Nationalism, — that men should regard themselves not as citizens of a paltry state but as citizens of the world.

[27] Baron vom Stein was made chief minister by King Frederick William, Oct. 4, 1807, and given a free hand in carrying out proposed reforms. At the end of thirteen months Napoleon, who recognized the tendency and aim of Stein's measures, forced the king to dismiss him from office. Prince von Hardenberg succeeded him and carried on more cautiously the work he had begun.

change had a great effect on Prussia's future. Henceforth she was not merely a state but a nation.

Along with serfdom, class privileges and distinctions, which had divided the population of Prussia into classes separated by almost impassable lines, were now swept away. The towns were given a measure of local self-government, which was to prepare the way for the representatives of the people to participate in the national government.

While Stein and Hardenberg were effecting these reforms in the civil realm, Scharnhorst, the Minister of War, was reorganizing the army on the model of that of France. The old army, which had gone to pieces so disgracefully on the field of Jena, was made up of conscripted peasants, officered by incompetent and insolent nobles. Flogging was the punishment for even the most trivial offenses. The new army was an army of self-respecting citizens, a truly national army, based on the principle of compulsory universal military service in which both officers and men received special training for their duties.

Thus equality in all relations, civil and military, replaced galling and degrading inequality. The effect of these reforms upon the spirit of the people was magical. They effected the political regeneration of Prussia. In other words, Stein and Hardenberg and Scharnhorst did for Prussia, in the name of the king, what the Constituent Assembly and the Convention, in the name of the people, had done for France. Prussia now became a strong nation, because Prussia was no longer simply the king and the aristocracy, but also the Prussian people.

The new Prussia became the leader of the German nation in the memorable War of Liberation, which we are now approaching. This uprising of the Prussian nation against Napoleon forms one of the most dramatic and remarkable passages in the history of the German people.

641. Napoleon's Invasion of Russia (1812–1813). — The signal for the general uprising of Germany and the rest of Europe was the terrible misfortune which befell Napoleon in his invasion of Russia. Various circumstances had concurred to weaken the

friendship and break the alliance between the Russian Emperor and Napoleon; but the main cause of mutual distrust and alienation was the Continental Blockade. This had inflicted great loss upon Russian trade, and the Tsar had finally refused to carry out Napoleon's decrees, and entered a coalition against France.

Napoleon resolved to force Russia, as he had the rest of continental Europe, to bow to his will. Gathering contingents from all his vassal states, he crossed the Russian frontier at the head of what was proudly called the Grand Army, numbering upwards of four hundred thousand men. After making a single stand at Smolensk, the Russian army avoided battle, and as it retreated into the interior devastated the country in front of the advancing enemy. Finally, at Borodino, seventy miles from Moscow, the



FIG. 96. — THE KREMLIN OF MOSCOW. (From a photograph)

Russians halted and offered battle to cover the city, but in a terribly bloody struggle, in which the aggregate loss in killed and wounded of the two armies was upwards of seventy thousand men, their resistance was broken and the invaders entered the ancient capital in triumph.

To his astonishment Napoleon found the city practically deserted by its inhabitants; and two days after he had established himself in the empty palace of the Tsar (in the Kremlin), fires, started in some unknown way, broke out simultaneously in different quarters of the city. The conflagration raged for five days, until the greater part of the city was reduced to ashes.

Napoleon's situation was now critical. He had confidently expected, from his knowledge of the Emperor Alexander, that

as soon as the French army was in Moscow he would sue for peace. But to Napoleon's messages Alexander returned for reply that he would not enter into negotiations with him so long as a single French soldier stood upon Russian soil.

In the hope that the Tsar would abandon his heroic resolve, Napoleon lingered about the ruined city until the middle of October, and then finally gave orders for the return march. This delay was a fatal mistake, and resulted in one of the greatest tragedies in history. Before the retreating French columns had covered half the distance to the frontier, the terrible Russian winter was upon them. The sufferings of the ill-clad soldiers were intense. Thousands were frozen to death. The spot of each bivouac was marked by the circle of dead around the watch fires. Sometimes in a single night as many as two or three hundred perished. Thousands more were slain by the peasants and the wild Cossacks, who hovered about the retreating columns and harassed them day and night. The passage of the river Beresina was attended with appalling losses.

Soon after the passage of this stream Napoleon, conscious that the fate of his empire depended upon his presence in Paris, left the remnant of the army in charge of his marshals and hurried by post to his capital.

The loss by death of the French and their allies in this disastrous campaign is reckoned at upwards of two hundred and fifty thousand men, while that of the Russians is estimated to have been almost as large.

642. The War of Liberation; the Battle of Leipzig, the "Battle of the Nations" (Oct. 16–19, 1813). — Napoleon's fortunes were buried with his Grand Army in the snows of Russia. His woeful losses here, taken in connection with his great losses in Spain, encouraged the European powers to think that now they could crush him. A sixth coalition was formed, embracing Russia, Prussia, England, Sweden, and later Austria.

Napoleon made gigantic efforts to prepare for the final struggle. By the spring of 1813 he was at the head of a new army, numbering eventually over three hundred thousand men,

— boys we should say, so extremely young were a large number of the fresh recruits. Falling upon the allied armies of the Russians and Prussians, first at Lützen and then at Bautzen, Napoleon gained a decisive victory upon both fields. Austria now appeared in the lists, and at Leipzig, in Saxony, Napoleon was attacked by the leagued armies of Europe. So many were the powers represented upon this renowned field that it is known in history as the "Battle of the Nations." The combat lasted three days. Napoleon was defeated and forced to retreat into France.

Some attempts at negotiations which were now made proved futile, since Napoleon, desperate as was his situation, would not accept the reasonable terms offered him by the allies, which were in substance that France should be content with her natural boundaries, — the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees.

The armies of the allies now poured over all the French frontiers. Napoleon's tremendous efforts to roll back the tide of invasion were all in vain. Paris surrendered to the allies (March 31, 1814). As the struggle became manifestly hopeless, his most trusted officers deserted and betrayed him. The French Senate, acting under the inspiration of the celebrated Talleyrand, who had earlier served Napoleon as his Minister of Foreign Affairs, issued a decree deposing the Emperor and restoring the throne to the Bourbons. Napoleon was forced to abdicate and was banished to the little island of Elba in the Mediterranean, being permitted to retain his title of Emperor and to keep about him a few of his old guards. But Elba was a very diminutive empire for one to whom the half of Europe had seemed too small, and we shall not be surprised to learn that Napoleon was not content with it.

643. **"The Hundred Days"** (March 20–June 29, 1815). — Upon invitation of the French Senate the brother of Louis XVI now assumed the crown with the title of Louis XVIII. With this new Bourbon king the allies arranged a treaty,[28] the shifty Talleyrand acting as Louis' representative. This treaty gave France the frontiers she had in 1792.

[28] First Treaty of Paris, May 30, 1814.

In accordance with a promise he had made, Louis gave France a constitution. Notwithstanding, he acted very much as though his power were unlimited. He styled himself "King of France and Navarre *by the grace of God*." He always alluded to the year in which he began to rule as the nineteenth year of his reign, thus affecting to ignore wholly the government of the Republic and the Empire. This excited alarm, because it seemed to question the validity of all that had been done since the dethronement and execution of Louis XVI.

The result of this reactionary policy was widespread dissatisfaction. Some, fearing lest all the work of the Revolution would be undone, began to desire the return of Napoleon, and the wish was perhaps what gave rise to the report which was spread about that he would come back with the spring violets.

In the month of March, 1815, as the commissioners of the various powers were sitting at Vienna rearranging the landmarks and boundaries obliterated by the French inundation, news was brought to them that Napoleon had escaped from Elba and was in France. At first the members of the Congress were incredulous, regarding the thing as a jest, and were with difficulty convinced of the truth of the report.

Taking advantage of the general dissatisfaction with the rule of the restored Bourbons, Napoleon had resolved upon a bold push for the recovery of his crown. Landing with about eight hundred guardsmen at one of the southern ports of France, he aroused all the country with one of his stirring addresses, and then immediately pushed on towards Paris. His journey to the capital was one continuous ovation. One regiment after another, forgetting their recent oath of loyalty to the Bourbons, hastened to join his train. His old generals and soldiers embraced him with transports of joy.[29] Marshal Ney, sent to arrest the Emperor, whom he had promised to bring to Paris in a cage, at the first sight of his old commander threw himself into his arms and pledged him his sword and his life. Louis XVIII, deserted by

[29] Napoleon's return was welcomed by the army, especially by the returned prisoners from Russia and Germany, but it was not welcomed by the French people generally.

his army, was left helpless, and, as Napoleon approached the gates of Paris, fled from his throne.

Napoleon desired peace with the sovereigns of Europe; but they did not think the peace of the continent could be maintained so long as he sat upon the French throne. For the seventh and last time the allies leagued their armies against "the disturber of the peace of Europe."

Hoping to overwhelm the armies of the allies by striking them one after another before they had time to unite, Napoleon moved swiftly into Belgium with an army of one hundred and thirty thousand in order to crush there the English under the Duke of Wellington and the Prussians under Blücher. He first fell in with and defeated the Prussian army, and then faced the English at Waterloo (June 18, 1815).

The story of Waterloo need not be told, — how all day the French broke their columns in vain on the English squares; how, at the critical moment towards the close of the day when Wellington was wishing for Blücher or for night, Blücher with a fresh force of thirty thousand Prussians turned the tide of battle; and how the famous Old Guard, which knew how to die but not how to surrender,[30] made its last charge and left its hitherto invincible squares upon the lost field.

A second time Napoleon was forced to abdicate,[31] and a second time Louis XVIII ascended his unstable throne.[32] Napoleon made his way to the coast, purposing to take ship for the United States; but the way was barred by British watchfulness, and he was constrained to surrender to the commander of the English war ship *Bellerophon*. "I come, like Themistocles," he said, "to throw myself upon the hospitality of the English people."

But no one believed that Napoleon could safely be left at large, or that his presence, even though he were in close confinement,

[30] General Cambronne, the commander of the Guard, when summoned to surrender, is said to have returned this reply: "The Guard dies, but never surrenders." There is doubt concerning the origin of the famous phrase.

[31] His abdication was in favor of his little son, whom he proclaimed "Napoleon II, Emperor of the French."

[32] The allies now signed with Louis what is known as the Second Treaty of Paris (Nov. 20, 1815). France had now to accept the frontiers which were hers in 1789.

anywhere in Europe would be consistent with the future security and repose of the continent. Some even urged that he be given up to Louis XVIII to be shot as a rebel and an outlaw. The final decision was that he should be banished to the island of St. Helena, in the South Atlantic. Thither he was carried by the English, and closely guarded by them until his death in 1821.

The story of these last years of Napoleon Bonaparte, as gathered from the companions of his exile, is one of the most pathetic in all history. At the time of his death he was in his fifty-second year. As a military genius and commander he left a deeper impress upon the imagination of the world, and fills a larger place in history, probably, than any other man who ever lived.

Selections from the Sources. — BOURRIENNE, *Memoirs of Napoleon Bonaparte.* Bourrienne was Bonaparte's schoolfellow and comrade, and then his private secretary from 1796 to 1802. TARBELL, *The Words of Napoleon*, contains interesting selections from Napoleon's addresses and letters. In reading these extracts it should be borne in mind that Napoleon's speeches, like his bulletins, often bore no relation to the actual facts or to his own real thoughts and purposes.

Secondary Works. — Among the numerous biographies of Napoleon the following possess special merit and authority: FOURNIER, *Napoleon the First;* JOHNSTON, *Napoleon;* ROSE, *The Life of Napoleon I;* SLOANE, *Life of Napoleon Bonaparte;* LANFREY, *The History of Napoleon the First* (left incomplete by the death of the author); SEELEY, *Napoleon the First;* and ROPES, *The First Napoleon.* Lanfrey makes the Emperor the subject of bitter reproach. One of the best extended histories of the Napoleonic period is THIERS, *History of the Consulate and the Empire.* Excellent short accounts are STEPHENS, *Revolutionary Europe, 1789–1815*, chaps. vii–xi; ROSE, *The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era*, last part, chap. vii; and ANDREWS, *The Historical Development of Europe*, vol. i, chap. ii.

Works dealing with special phases of the history of the period: MAHAN, *The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire*, vol. ii; SEELEY, *Life and Times of Stein;* and BIGELOW, *History of the German Struggle for Liberty.* See also LORD ROSEBERY, *Napoleon: the Last Phase;* on the Emperor's imprisonment at St. Helena.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Bonaparte at school. 2. The sale of Louisiana to the United States. 3. The Civil Code. 4. Execution of the Duke of Enghien. 5. The Congress at Erfurt. 6. Baron vom Stein and his reforms. 7. Napoleon at St. Helena.

III THE RESTORATION OF 1815 AND THE DEMOCRATIC REACTION: THE SEQUEL TO THE REVOLUTION

(1815–1904)

CHAPTER XXXV

THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA AND METTERNICH

644. Ideas bequeathed by the French Revolution to the Nineteenth Century. — The social and political history of Europe since the overthrow of Napoleon is a continuation of the history of the great social and political upheaval which we have been witnessing. The dominant forces at work throughout this period have been the ideas or principles inherited from the French Revolution.

There were three of these ideas, with which, as revolutionary forces in history, we have already become familiar in tracing the story of the Revolution and the Empire. The first was the idea or principle of equality. The Revolutionists proclaimed this doctrine with religious fervor. It was spread broadcast over Europe. The French army, as it has been tersely expressed, was "equality on the march." The Code Napoléon, as we have seen, embodied this principle of equality, and wherever it was set up,— in the Netherlands, in the West German states, in part of Poland, in Switzerland, and in Italy, — it exerted the same leveling influence that it had in France. As Christianity brought in equality before God, so did the Revolution bring in equality before Cæsar. The one made all men equal in the religious realm, the other made all men equal in the civil realm.

The second principle promulgated by the Revolution was that of popular sovereignty. According to this doctrine, governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. The laws should be the expression of the will of all. The people either directly or through their representatives should have part in the government. All rulers and magistrates are the servants of the people and are responsible to them.

The third principle that underlay the Revolution was that of nationality. This principle requires that the state shall coincide with the nation. It demands that every nation shall be free to choose its own form of government and to manage its own affairs in its own way. This idea worked itself out during the course of the Revolution. It was evoked, as we have learned, in great measure by Napoleon's cynical disregard of national sentiment and his wanton violation of national rights.

These principles or ideas, as we have said, were the precious political heritage which the nineteenth century received from the Revolution.[1] They were full of vitality and energy. Their outworking, their embodiment in social institutions, in law, in government, makes up a large part of the history of the more advanced nations of the world since the downfall of Napoleon.

But these ideas, as we have intimated, have not had free course. Their embodiment in social institutions and in political forms has, in most of the European countries, been a process violent and revolutionary in character. This has resulted from these liberal principles coming into conflict with certain opposing conservative doctrines with which they have had to struggle for supremacy. And this brings us to the starting point of the history of the nineteenth century, — the celebrated Congress of Vienna.

645. **The Congress of Vienna** (September, 1814–June, 1815). — After the first abdication of Napoleon, as we have seen, the European sovereigns, either in person or by their representatives,

[1] Of course these ideas were not novel doctrines promulgated now for the first time. All that is meant by calling them the ideas of the French Revolution is that by the Revolution they were invested with new authority and were given a new course in the world.

met at Vienna to readjust the affairs of the Continent. As we shall hereafter, in connection with the history of the separate European countries, have occasion to say something respecting the relations of each to the Congress, we shall here say only a word regarding the spirit and temper of the assembly and the general character of its work.

The Vienna commissioners seemed to have but one thought and aim, — to restore everything as nearly as possible to its condition before the Revolution. They had no care for the people; the princes were their only concern. The principle of nationality was wholly ignored, while that of the sovereignty of the people was, by most of the plenipotentiaries, looked upon as a principle of disorder to be repressed in every possible way.

The first principle adopted by the Congress was that of legitimacy. According to this principle a throne is to be regarded like any ordinary piece of property. Long possession gives a good and indefeasible title.

Under this rule all the new usurping families set up by Napoleon were swept aside without ceremony, and the old exiled dynasties were restored. The most important of these restitutions, effected either by the direct action of the Congress or already consummated by events and confirmed by it, were those which brought back the banished Bourbon dynasties in France, Spain, and Naples.[2]

The question of legitimacy having been settled, the next question was how the territories recovered from Napoleon should be distributed among the dynasties recognized as legitimate. For most of the sovereigns this was the subject of chief interest. Russia wanted the whole of Poland; Prussia wanted the kingdom of Saxony; Sweden wanted Norway; Austria wanted territory in Italy.

In making the distribution the Vienna map makers took no thought whatever of the rights and claims of race or nationality.

[2] The principle was applied only in the case of hereditary lay rulers. And even here an exception was made in the case of the hundreds of petty German rulers whose territories Napoleon in his reorganization of Germany had given to the larger states. These princelets were not restored.

EUROPE
After 1815
SCALE OF MILES
0 50 100 150 200
KINGDOM OF DENMARK
Kiel
Lubeck
Hamburg
Bremen
MECKLENBURG
Amsterdam
Rotterdam
KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS
Antwerp
Brussels
Louvain
Waterloo
Quatre Bras
Boulogne
Mons
Liny
Bonn
Aix la Chapelle
Ham
Sedan
Luxemburg
PARIS
Fontainebleau
Montereau
Troyes
Strasburg
Rastatt
Stuttgart
WURTEMBERG
Frankfort
Hanau
Wartburg
Leipzig
Carlsbad
Prague
Dresden
Brandenburg
Berlin
KINGDOM OF FRANCE
Dijon
Belfort
Basel
Zürich
Lucerne
BERNE
SWITZERLAND
Geneva
Lyons
Grenoble
Turin
Novara
Como
LOMBARDY
Milan
Verona
Venice
Mantua
Cremona
Alessandria
Genoa
Ferrara
Bologna
Rimini
Ancona
Nice
Antibes
Marseilles
Arignon
Nismes
Leghorn
DUCHY OF TUSCANY
ELBA
Civita Vecchia
ROME
KINGDOM OF NAPLES
KINGDOM OF SPAIN
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
0°
4°
8°
12°
52°
48°
44°
Longitude East from

16°
20°
24°
28°
32°
52°
48°
44°
BALTIC SEA
PRUSSIA
Danzig
Thorn
Posen
Warsaw
Niemen R.
Vilna
LITHUANIA
RUSSIA
Bialystock
Vistula
Vistula R.
POLAND
VOLHYNIA
Dnieper R.
Dniester R.
Pruth R.
Bug R.
EMPIRE
Breslau
Katzbach
Bautzen
Elbe
Troppau
GALICIA
PODOLIA
VIENNA
Pressburg
Komorn
Buda Pesth
Raab
Debreczin
Nagy Salo
TRANSYLVANIA
Vilagos
Temesvar
Theiss R.
Maros R.
Drave R.
Agram
HUNGARIAN EMPIRE
MOLDAVIA
Jassy
Odessa
Akerman
WALLACHIA
Bucharest
DOBRUDSCHA
Kustendjeh
BLACK SEA
SLAVONIA
CROATIA
BOSNIA
SERVIA
Belgrade
Widdin
Danube R.
Rustchuk
Nicopolis
Sistova
Shumla
Varna
Plevna
Tirnova
Shipka Pass
Bourgas
Alexinatz
Morava R.
HERZEGOVINA
Novibazar
Sofia
BULGARIA
EMPIRE
Kazanlik
Maritza R.
Philippopolis
Adrianople
DALMATIA
ALBANIA
Antivari
Ducigno
CONSTANTINOPLE

The inhabitants of the countries available for division were apportioned among the different sovereigns exactly as a herd of cattle might be divided up and apportioned among different owners. The following territorial settlements were among the most important.

The Belgian and Dutch provinces were united into a single state, which under the name of the Kingdom of the Netherlands was given to a prince of the House of Orange. The idea here was to create on this side of France as strong a barrier as possible against French aggression in the future. The fact that the Dutch and the Belgians, by reason of differences in race, in religion, and in industrial development, formed really two distinct nations was wholly ignored.

Sweden was confirmed in the possession of Norway,[3] which Denmark lost as a consequence of her alliance with Napoleon.

Russia was allowed to retain Finland and Bessarabia, and was given the greater part of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. The Polish lands acquired by Russia were made into what was called the Kingdom of Poland, with the Tsar as its king. The Poles were informed that they must give up all thought and hope of the restoration of their national independence.

Prussia was given about half of the kingdom of Saxony, extensive territories on both sides of the Rhine, and other lands, which gave her a more preponderant position in Germany than she had before the Revolution.

Austria, in compensation for the loss of her Netherland provinces, was given, besides a long strip of the eastern shore lands of the Adriatic Sea, Lombardy and Venetia in Upper Italy. This extension of Austrian rule over Italian lands was one of the grossest violations of the principles of nationality of which the Congress was guilty, and was to be signally avenged when the hour for Italian unity and independence arrived.

[3] In the midst of the War of Liberation, Bernadotte, king of Sweden, had forced from the Danish king (Treaty of Kiel, Jan. 14, 1814) the cession of Norway. The arrangement in the Scandinavian peninsula confirmed by the Congress subsisted until 1905, when Norway declared the union dissolved, and, choosing Prince Charles of Denmark as king, became an independent kingdom.

In Germany the Congress built upon the basis laid by Napoleon. Thirty-nine of the forty-two sovereign states, including Prussia and Austria, to which he had reduced the hundreds of states constituting the old Germanic system, were organized into a confederation modeled upon the Confederation of the Rhine.[4]

In Italy, on the other hand, Napoleon's work was undone and the old order of things was reëstablished. With the exception of the provinces in the north, which had been given to Austria, the peninsula was divided into independent states, such as had existed before the Revolution.

A third matter which occupied the attention particularly of the committee on German affairs was the granting of constitutions to their subjects by the different sovereigns. In spirit and in temper the restored rulers were for the most part the old pre-revolutionary despots come to their own again, but thoroughly frightened by what had happened. Their desire was to rule in the old arbitrary way; but there were those among them who recognized that a change had come over the world, and that the old absolutism could not with safety be reëstablished. The Tsar Alexander seemed to entertain some genuine liberal ideas.

Consequently constitutions were talked about. Louis XVIII had been required by the terms of the treaties of Paris to give France a constitution, the allies understanding perfectly that if the restored Bourbons should attempt to rule as absolute sovereigns there would be trouble again which would unsettle everything in Europe. And now the Congress recommended to the German princes that representative bodies (Assemblies of Estates) be established in each state. But the only states, besides France, which at this time actually received constitutions were the Netherlands, Switzerland, Poland, and Norway.

And even where constitutions already existed or were now granted, these charters gave the people very little share in the government. They were constitutions of the aristocratic type, that is, they placed the government, where its form was monarchical, in the hands of the sovereign and a very small body of

[4] For further details concerning the reorganization of Germany, see sec. 701.

voters. Practically the old régime of absolutism was almost everywhere reëstablished.

But the Revolution had impaired beyond restoration reverence for the divine right of kings. An attempt to restore autocratic government in Europe was an attempt to restore an outgrown cult, — to set up again the fallen Dagon in his place. Notwithstanding, the commissioners at Vienna, blind to the spirit and tendencies of the times, did set up once more the broken idol, — only, however, to see it flung down again by the memorable political upheavals of the next half century. The kings had had their Congress; the people were to have theirs, — in 1820 and '30 and '48.

FIG. 97. — PRINCE METTERNICH (From a painting by *Sir Thomas Lawrence*)

646. Prince Metternich, the Incarnation of the Spirit of the Restoration. — The spirit of the monarchical restoration of 1815, the spirit which controlled the Congress of Vienna, was incarnate in the celebrated Austrian minister, Prince Metternich.

Metternich hated the Revolution, which to him was the spirit of evil let loose in the world. The democratic spirit he declared to be the spirit of disorder which could not fail "to change daylight into darkest night." The demand of the people for a share in government he regarded as presumptuous, and was wholly convinced that any concession to their demands could result in nothing save horrible confusion and bloodshed.

Metternich's system, therefore, was a system of repression. His maxim was, Let nothing be changed. A diplomatist of wonderful astuteness, of wide experience, and possessed of an intimate knowledge of the public affairs of all Europe, Metternich exerted a vast influence upon the history of the years from 1815 to 1848. This period might appropriately be called the Age of

Metternich. It was due largely to the Prince that during this period the old autocratic form of government prevailed so generally in Europe.

647. Metternich and the Holy Alliance. — The activity of Metternich during the earlier portion of the period of his ascendancy was so closely connected with a celebrated league known as the Holy Alliance that we must here say a word respecting the origin of this association.

The Holy Alliance was a religious league formed just after the fall of Napoleon by the Tsar Alexander and having as its chief members Russia, Austria, and Prussia. The ostensible object of the league was the maintenance of religion, peace, and order in Europe and the reduction to practice in politics of the maxims of Christ. The several sovereigns entering into the union promised to be fathers to their people, to rule in love and with reference solely to the promotion of the welfare of their subjects.

All this had a very millennial look. But the Holy Alliance very soon became practically a league for the maintenance of absolute principles of government, in opposition to the liberal tendencies of the age. Under the pretext of maintaining religion, justice, and order, the sovereigns of the union acted in concert to suppress every aspiration for political liberty among their subjects.

648. Other Nineteenth-Century Principles, Movements, and Interests. — Lest the foregoing paragraphs should create in the mind of the reader a wrong impression of nineteenth-century history, we must here remind him of what we have said repeatedly, namely, that no single formula will suffice to sum up the history of any age. History is ever very complex, for many ideas and many forces are always simultaneously at work shaping and coloring events.

The history of the nineteenth century presents a special complexity. While the great ideas transmitted to the age as a bequest from the Revolution were forces that gave the age its chief features, still throughout the century various other ideas, principles, and interests manifested themselves and contributed greatly to fill particularly the later years of the period with a vast complexity of movements, — intellectual, political, and industrial.

The spirit of the Renaissance was in the society of the period a pervasive and powerful influence. Throughout the century intelligence was becoming more diffused, and modern science, the special product of the Revival of Learning, was constantly revealing fresh wonders and arming man with new instruments of research and of mastery over nature.

The true spirit of the Reformation, too, was at work. As the century advanced, creeds grew more liberal, and the beneficent sentiment of toleration in religion, which has been declared to be "the best fruit of the last four centuries," [5] made rapid progress in the world.

Furthermore, the century was marked by a wonderful expansion movement of the European peoples, a movement which has given the world into the possession of the new and higher civilization created by the revolutions of the last three centuries in the home land of Europe. To this significant movement we shall devote a separate chapter under the heading "The Expansion of Europe."

Lastly, the nineteenth century witnessed an unparalleled industrial development, resulting from fortunate mechanical inventions and a great variety of other causes. To the phenomena of this new movement we shall be able to devote only a few closing paragraphs. In these we shall attempt nothing more than merely to indicate the relation of this industrial revolution to the general development of human society.

Selections from the Sources. — *Memoirs of Prince Metternich* (trans. by Mrs. Alexander Napier), vol. ii, pp. 553–599, and vols. iii–v. These volumes cover the years from 1815 to 1829. They are of the first importance for this period. In them the spirit of the Restoration is incarnated. FORD, *Life and Letters of Madame Krüdener*. This work lights up a remarkable passage in the life of the Russian Emperor Alexander I, and reveals the genesis of the Holy Alliance. *Translations and Reprints*, vol. i, No. 3, "The Restoration and the European Policy of Metternich" (ed. by James Harvey Robinson).

Secondary Works. — Among the great number of works on nineteenth-century history the following are among the best of those in English which present in brief survey the whole or some considerable part of the history

[5] The inscription written by President Charles W. Eliot for the Water Gate of the World's Columbian Exposition at Chicago in 1893.

of the period: FYFFE, *A History of Modern Europe, 1792–1878;* PHILLIPS, *Modern Europe, 1815–1899;* ANDREWS, *The Historical Development of Modern Europe;* SEIGNOBOS, *A Political History of Europe since 1814;* WHITCOMB, *A History of Modern Europe;* ROBINSON, *An Introduction to the History of Western Europe;* MÜLLER, *Political History of Recent Times;* and JUDSON, *Europe in the Nineteenth Century.*

Biographies and works dealing with some particular subject or some limited portion of the nineteenth century: STEPHENS, *Revolutionary Europe, 1789–1815*, "Introduction," for suggestive paragraphs on the principles which have molded nineteenth-century history, and chap. xi, for the Congress of Vienna; MALLESON, *Life of Prince Metternich;* LOWELL, *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe;* and LODGE, *A History of Modern Europe*, chaps. xxv–xxviii.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Talleyrand at the Congress of Vienna. 2. Prince Metternich and his system. 3. Madame Krüdener and the Tsar Alexander I.

CHAPTER XXXVI

FRANCE SINCE THE SECOND RESTORATION (1815–1905)

649. **Character of the Period.** — The social and political history of France since the second restoration of the Bourbons may be characterized briefly. It has been simply a continuation of the Revolution,[1] — of the struggle between democratic and monarchical principles. The aim of the Revolution was to abolish privileges and establish rights, — to give every man lot and part in the government under which he lives. These liberal ideas and principles have on the whole, notwithstanding repeated reverses, gained ground; for revolutions never move backward. There may be eddies and countercurrents in a river, but the steady and powerful sweep of the stream is ever onward towards the sea. Not otherwise is it with the great social and intellectual movements of history.

650. **The Reign of Louis XVIII** (1815[14]–1824). — "Your king, whose fathers reigned over your fathers for more than eight centuries, now returns to devote the rest of his days to defend and to comfort you."

Such were the words used by Louis upon his second return to his people after Waterloo. The events of the Hundred Days had instructed and humbled him: "I may have made mistakes," he said frankly, "and probably have done so."

Profiting by his experience, Louis ruled throughout a great part of the remainder of his reign with reasonable heed to the changes effected by the Revolution. But as he grew old and infirm he yielded more and more to the extreme Royalist party,

[1] Each of the revolutions of the period may be characterized as Metternich characterized the Revolution of 1830, namely, "as nothing else than a recurrence of the Revolution of 1789."

which was again raising its head, and the government entered upon a course looking to the restoration of the old order of things.

651. The Reign of Charles X (1824–1830); the Revolution of 1830. — Upon the death of Louis in 1824 and the accession of Charles X, this reactionary policy soon became more pronounced. The new king seemed utterly incapable of profiting by the teachings of the past. It was particularly his blind, stubborn course that gave point to the saying, "A Bourbon learns nothing and forgets nothing."

It is not necessary for our purpose that we rehearse in detail what Charles did or what he failed to do. His aim was to undo the work of the Revolution, just as it was the aim of James II in England to undo the work of the Puritan Revolution. He disregarded the constitution, restored the clergy to power, reëstablished a strict censorship of the press, and changed the laws by royal proclamation. He seemed bent on restoring divine-right monarchy in France. He declared that he would rather saw wood for a living than rule after the fashion of the English kings.

The outcome of Charles' course might have been foreseen: Paris rose in revolt; the streets were blocked with barricades; Charles was escorted to the seacoast, whence he took ship for England.

France did not at this time think of a republic. She was inclined to try further the experiment of a constitutional monarchy. Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans, who represented the younger branch of the Bourbon family, was placed on the throne and the constitution was revised. In the charter which Louis XVIII had granted he had styled himself "King of France *by the grace of God*." The new constitution declared Louis Philippe to be "King of the French by the grace of God *and by the will of the nation*." The first principle of the Revolution — the sovereignty of the people — was thus embodied in the fundamental law of France.

Louis Philippe had traveled about the world considerably and had lived in a democratic sort of way. He had looked on complacently at the taking of the Bastille, had been in America, and

had taught school in Switzerland. The middle classes therefore with some reason looked upon him as one of themselves, and gave him the title of "Citizen King."

652. **Effect upon Europe of the "July Revolution" of 1830; Origin of the Kingdom of Belgium.** — France has been called the Enceladus of Europe. There is sufficient instruction in the suggested parable to make it worth our while to recall the myth to memory. As fable has it, Enceladus was one of the giants who made war upon Olympian Jove. In the rout of the giants, Minerva, helping Jove, disabled Enceladus by throwing Ætna on top of him and pinning him forever to the earth. The stability of things in Sicily was thereby endangered, for as often as the giant turned his weary sides the whole island was convulsed.

France having made war upon the Olympian hierarchy of divine-right kings is by them worsted in battle and then pinned to the earth with the weight of Bourbonism. As often as the giant turns his weary sides there is an eruption, and the whole continent, like Trinacria of old, trembles to its remotest verge.

The convulsion in Paris shook all the restored thrones, and for a moment threatened to topple into ruins the whole fabric of absolutism that had been so carefully upreared by Metternich and the other political restorationists of the Congress of Vienna.

In the Netherlands the artificial order established in 1815 (sec. 645) was wholly destroyed. The Belgians arose, declared themselves independent of Holland, adopted a liberal constitution, and elected Leopold of Saxe-Coburg as their king (1831). Thus came into existence the separate kingdom of Belgium. The independence and neutrality of the little state was guaranteed by all the great powers.

653. **The Revolution of 1848 and the Establishment of the Second Republic.** — The reign of Louis Philippe up to 1848 was very unquiet, yet was not marked by any disturbance of great importance. But during all this time the ideas of the Revolution were working among the people, and the democratic party was constantly gaining in strength. Finally, there came a demand for the extension of the suffrage. At this time there were only about

two hundred thousand voters in France, the possession of a certain amount of property being required as a qualification for the franchise. The government steadily refused all electoral reforms. Guizot, the king's chief minister, declared that "this world is no place for universal suffrage."

Enceladus at last turned his weary sides. There was a convulsion like that of 1830. The center of this disturbance of course was Paris. Louis Philippe, thoroughly frightened by the prodigy, fled to England. After his departure the Paris mob dragged the throne out of the Tuileries and made a bonfire of it.

The Second Republic was now established, with the poet historian Lamartine as its provisional Minister for Foreign Affairs. A new constitution, some features of which were copied from the constitution of the United States, established universal suffrage.[2] The number of voters was at a stroke increased from a quarter of a million to upwards of eight millions. An election being ordered, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte,[3] a nephew of the great Napoleon, was chosen President of the new Republic (Dec. 10, 1848).

The Paris "February Revolution," as it is called, lighted the beacon fires of liberty throughout Europe.[4] "It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that, during the month of March, 1848, not a single day passed without a constitution being granted somewhere." France had made another of her irresistible invasions of the states of Europe, — "an invasion of ideas."

[2] There was a socialistic element in this Revolution of '48. It was inaugurated by the working classes of Paris. One of the demands of the socialists was that the government should find work for the unemployed. National workshops were established by the provisional government, but the experiment was unsuccessful and the shops were soon closed.

[3] This man had already played a singular rôle. In 1836 he had appeared suddenly at Strasburg, thinking to raise the French garrison there against the government. He was arrested and banished to America. Again in 1840 the adventurer, taking advantage of the revival of popular interest in the first Napoleon caused by the bringing of his ashes from St. Helena to France, made a somewhat similar attempt at revolution at Boulogne. He was arrested a second time and condemned to imprisonment for life in the fortress of Ham in Picardy. After about five years' confinement he escaped and found his way to England.

[4] The revolution in Paris was not so much the cause as merely the signal for revolutions elsewhere. It imparted fresh energy to revolutionary forces which were ready to break forth or which had already found vent in violent explosions.

654. The Second Empire (1852–1870). — The life of the Second Republic spanned only three years. By almost exactly the same steps as those by which his uncle had mounted the imperial throne, Louis Napoleon now also ascended to the imperial dignity, crushing the Republic as he rose.

A contest having arisen between the President and the National Assembly, the President planned a *coup d'état*, — a second Eighteenth Brumaire (sec. 607). He caused the arrest at night of the most prominent of the deputies opposed to him in the Assembly and such popular leaders in Paris as might incite the people to resistance. When the inhabitants of the capital awoke in the morning (Dec. 2, 1851) they found the city placarded with proclamations announcing the dissolution of the Assembly and outlining the main articles of a new constitution, which was to be at once submitted to the people for approval.

FIG. 98. — NAPOLEON III. (After a portrait by *F. Winterhalter*)

The President's appeal to the people to indorse what he had done met with a most extraordinary response. By a majority of almost seven million votes [5] the nation approved the President's *coup d'état* and rewarded him for it by extending his term of office to ten years. This was in effect the revival of the Consulate of 1799. The next year Louis Napoleon was made Emperor, and took the title of Napoleon III (1852).

The secret of Louis Napoleon's success in his *coup d'état* was in part the fear that prevailed of the renewal of the Terror of '93, and in part the magic power of the name he bore. At just this time the name Napoleon was in France a name to conjure with. There had been growing up a Napoleonic legend. Time had idealized the founder of the First Empire.

[5] The exact vote was 7,481,216 to 684,419.

As the Second and the Third Republic were simply revivals and continuations of the First Republic, so was the Second Empire merely the revival and continuation of the First Empire. It was virtually the same in origin, in spirit, and in policy.

Louis Napoleon had declared that the Empire meant peace. But it meant anything except that. The pages of its history are filled with the records of wars. There were three important ones in which the armies of the Empire took part, — the Crimean War

THIERS

(1853–1856), the Austro-Sardinian War (1859), and the Franco-Prussian War (1870–1871).

The first two of these wars need not detain us at this time, since we shall speak of them later in connection with Russian and Italian affairs.[6] All that need be said here is that in each of them Louis Napoleon greatly enhanced his prestige throughout Europe. Respecting the causes of the Franco-Prussian War something will be said later in connection with the rise of Germany as an imperial power (sec. 712), therefore only the chief facts relating

[6] See secs. 694 and 722.

to the war itself will be given here. Like the war against Austria, this one also was short and decisive. France was invaded by three immense German armies.

One large French army was defeated in the memorable battle of Gravelotte (Aug. 18, 1870) and shut up in Metz. Then followed the surrender at Sedan, where eighty-three thousand men, including the Emperor himself, gave themselves up as prisoners of war[7] (Sept. 2, 1870).

The German columns now advanced to Paris and began the investment of the city (Sept. 19, 1870). All reasonable hope of a successful defense of the capital was soon destroyed by the surrender to the Germans of Marshal Bazaine at Metz (Oct. 23, 1870). One hundred and seventy-three thousand soldiers and six thousand officers became prisoners of war, — the largest army up to this time ever taken captive.

But Paris held out stubbornly, with great suffering from cold and hunger, three months longer; and then, all outside measures for raising the siege having failed, capitulated (Jan. 30, 1871).

Outside of Paris, at Bordeaux, was a sort of provisional government headed by M. Thiers, which had been organized after the capture of the Emperor. With this body the conquerors carried on their negotiations for peace. The terms of the treaty were that France should surrender to Germany the Rhenish province of Alsace and one half of Lorraine, pay an indemnity of five thousand million francs (about $1,000,000,000), and consent to the occupation of certain portions of French territory until the fine was paid. Never before was such a ransom paid by a nation.

The most lamentable part of the struggle now began. The Red Republicans or Communists of Paris,[8] rising in insurrection against the provisional government both because of what it represented — the cause and programme of the conservative, property-holding classes — and because of its action in assenting to the

[7] After the war Louis Napoleon found an asylum in England (at Chiselhurst), where he died Jan. 9, 1873.

[8] The strength of this party lay in the workingmen of Paris. It was the heir of the extreme Republican party of 1848 (sec. 653, n. 2) and in a sense the precursor of the socialist party found to-day in almost every country.

dismemberment of France, organized a Committee of Public Safety in imitation of that of 1793, and called the population of the capital to arms. The government finally succeeded in suppressing the insurgents, and order was restored, though only after the destruction by fire of many public buildings, and frightful slaughters in the streets and squares of the city.

655. The Third Republic (1870–). — The provisional government which replaced the Empire was republican in form. M. Thiers, the historian, was the first President (1871–1873). But not until 1875 was it definitely decided that France should be a republic and not a monarchy or an empire. In that year a constitution[9] was adopted, the tenth since 1791, which provided definitely for a republican form of government.

France has now been continuously under a republican form of government since 1870, a longer period of freedom from revolution than any other since 1792. The current of political events, however, has during this time run somewhat turbulently. There have been many changes of presidents[10] and of ministries, and much party rancor has been displayed; yet in spite of all untoward circumstances the cause of the Republic has steadily advanced, while that of the Monarchy and that of the Empire have as steadily gone backward. Bourbons and Bonapartes, like Stuarts, have gone into an exile from which there is no return.

Many of the difficulties and problems which have confronted the Republic were legacies to it from the Monarchy and the Empire, or more directly from the Franco-Prussian War.

An unfortunate heritage from the war that destroyed the Empire is the Alsace and Lorraine question. The deep resentment

[9] This constitution is not, like our own, a single document, but consists of a series of laws passed at different times. As it now stands it provides for a legislature of two chambers, a Senate and a Chamber of Deputies, a President elected for seven years by the chambers in a joint meeting, and a Cabinet responsible to the legislature. The suffrage is universal.

[10] These are the presidents of the Republic since the resignation of Thiers in 1873: Marshal MacMahon (resigned), 1873–1879; M. Grévy (resigned), 1879–1887; M. Carnot (assassinated), 1887–1894; M. Casimir-Périer (resigned), 1894–1895; M. Félix Faure (died in office), 1895–1899; M. Loubet (1899–1906); M. Fallières (1906–1913); and M. Poincaré (1913–).

felt by the French towards Germany for this mutilation of France, together with the fear of further German aggression, caused the French government in 1891 to enter into a defensive alliance with Russia — an alliance which, as we shall see, was freighted with momentous consequences.

A second legacy to the Republic was influential parties of Monarchists and Imperialists, who endeavored in every way to discredit the republican régime and watched for an opportunity to set up again either the Monarchy or the Empire. The dangerous intrigues of these parties led in 1886 to the expulsion from France of all the Bourbon and Bonaparte claimants of the throne and their direct heirs.

A third bequest to the Republic from the ancient régime was the educational problem. Before the Revolution, education in France was mainly in the hands of the religious orders. The Revolution swept away these bodies and secularized the educational system.

The restoration of the Monarchy brought about also the restoration of the religious orders. The system of education was now mixed, being in part lay and in part clerical. Two wholly different spirits were at work in it, — the spirit of the ancient, and the spirit of the modern, régime. Among the Liberals a strong section demanded the suppression of the clerical schools and the complete secularization of education.

The first of the religious associations to suffer was the Society of Jesus. In 1880 the convents and schools of the Jesuits were closed and the society was expelled from France. In 1903 fifty-four religious orders of men, embracing teaching, preaching, and commercial associations, were suppressed. Over two thousand convents were closed. The wisdom as well as the justice of this censorship of teaching may well be questioned.

The Republic has also had troubles which can in no sense be regarded as an inheritance from the ancient régime. During the years 1889–1892 all France was shaken by a great scandal arising from the gross mismanagement and failure of a company organized by Ferdinand de Lesseps, who had won great fame by the successful construction of the Suez Canal, for the digging of a

similar canal at the Isthmus of Panama. After the expenditure of upwards of $260,000,000, with the work in a very unsatisfactory condition, the company became bankrupt. It then developed that bribery and corruption on a scale as gigantic as the undertaking itself had been resorted to by the promoters of the enterprise. Prosecutions followed. Among those condemned to severe punishment was Ferdinand de Lesseps himself. He was already dying from age and worry when this final blow fell upon him. It was a pathetic ending of a career which, aside from this last deplorable incident, is one of the most illustrious in modern French history.[11]

As to the part which France has taken in recent colonial enterprises, particularly in the opening up to civilization of the continent of Africa, we shall find it more convenient to speak in another connection (Chapter XLIII).

Selections from the Sources. — FORBES, *My Experience of the War between France and Germany;* BINGHAM, *Journal of the Siege of Paris.* A graphic account of the siege by an Englishman who remained in Paris in order "to observe the conduct of the citizens." For material for a systematic study of the period, the special student should turn to ANDERSON, *Constitutions and other Select Documents.*

Secondary Works. — In most of the works cited for the preceding chapter will be found chapters and sections dealing with French affairs during the period under review. To these authorities add the following: MARTIN, *A Popular History of France,* vols. ii (last part) and iii; HANOTAUX, *Contemporary France;* BODLEY, *France* (a study of political institutions); DICKINSON, *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France;* COUBERTIN, *The Evolution of France under the Third Republic;* and LEBON and PELET, *France as it is.*

For the Second Empire: JERROLD, *The Life of Napoleon III,* and FORBES, *The Life of Napoleon the Third.*

For brief summaries of the events of the period: LEBON, *Modern France,* chaps. viii–xvi; DURUY, *A History of France;* ADAMS, *The Growth of the French Nation,* chap. xviii; and HASSALL, *The French People,* chaps. xviii–xxi and xxiii.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Louis Napoleon before 1848. 2. The Paris Commune of 1871. 3. Alfred Dreyfus. 4. Ferdinand de Lesseps and the Panama Canal. 5. France and the Vatican.

[11] Another unfortunate affair belonging to this period is the case of Alfred Dreyfus, a young Jewish captain of artillery in the French army, who became the victim of a cruel and unjust sentence by a military court. The story is too long for recital here.

FIG. 99. — QUEEN VICTORIA AS A YOUNG WOMAN
(After a painting by *Patridge*)

CHAPTER XXXVII

ENGLAND SINCE THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO (1815–1905)

656. The Four Chief Matters. — English history during the nineteenth century embraces a multitude of events. A short chapter covering the entire period will possess no instructive value unless it reduces the heterogeneous mass of facts to some sort of unity by placing events in relation with their causes, and thus shows how they are connected with a few broad national movements or tendencies.

Studying the period in this way, we shall find that very many of its leading events may be summed up under the four following heads: (1) progress towards democracy; (2) extension of the principle of religious equality; (3) England's relations with Ireland; and (4) the growth of the British colonial empire.

We shall attempt nothing more in the present chapter than to indicate the most prominent matters that should claim the student's attention along the first three lines of inquiry, reserving for later sections the consideration of England's colonial affairs.

I. Progress towards Democracy

657. Introductory. — The English Revolution of 1688 transferred authority from the king to the Parliament. The elective branch of that body, however, rested upon a very narrow electoral basis. Out of upwards of five million Englishmen who should have had a voice in the government, less than two hundred thousand were voters, and these were chiefly of the rich upper classes. The political democratizing of England during the nineteenth century consists in the widening of the electorate, — in the giving to every intelligent and honest man a right to vote, to participate in the government under which he lives.

658. Effects of the French Revolution upon Liberalism in England; Reform versus Revolution. — The French Revolution at first gave a fresh impulse to liberal tendencies. The English Liberals watched the course of the French Republicans with the deepest interest and sympathy. It will be recalled how the statesman Fox rejoiced at the fall of the Bastille, and what auguries of hope he saw in that event (sec. 567). The young writers, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Southey, were all infected with democratic sentiments and inspired with a generous enthusiasm for political liberty and equality. But the wild excesses of the French levelers terrified the English Liberals. There was a sudden revulsion of feeling. Liberal sentiments were denounced as dangerous and revolutionary.

But in a few years after the downfall of Napoleon the terrors of the French Revolution were forgotten. Liberal sentiments began to spread among the masses. The people very justly complained that, while the English government claimed to be a government of the people, they had no part in it.

Now, it is instructive to note the different ways in which Liberalism was dealt with by the English government and by the rulers on the Continent. In the continental countries the rising spirit of democracy was met by cruel and despotic repressions. The people were denied by their rulers all participation in the affairs of government. We have seen the result of this

policy in France, and later shall see the outcome of it in other continental countries. Liberalism triumphed indeed at last, but triumphed only through revolution.

In England the government did not resist the popular demands to the point of revolution. It made timely concessions to the growing spirit of democracy. Hence here, instead of a series of revolutions we have a series of reform measures which, gradually popularizing the House of Commons, at last rendered the English nation, not alone in name but in reality, a self-governing people.

659. The Reform Bill of 1832. — The first Parliamentary step in reform was taken in 1832. To understand this important act a glance backward becomes necessary.

When, in 1265, the Commons were first admitted to Parliament, members were called only from those cities and boroughs whose wealth and population fairly entitled them to representation. In the course of time some of these places dwindled in population and new towns sprang up; yet the decayed boroughs retained their ancient privilege of sending members to Parliament, while the new towns were left entirely without representation. Thus Old Sarum, an ancient town now utterly decayed and without a single inhabitant, was represented in the Commons by two members. Furthermore, the sovereign, for the purpose of gaining influence in the Commons, had, from time to time, given unimportant places the right of returning members to the Lower House. It was inevitable that elections in these small or "pocket boroughs," as they were called, should almost always be determined by the corrupt influence of the crown or of the great landowners. The Lower House of Parliament was thus filled with the nominees of the king, or with persons who had bought their seats, often with little effort at concealment. At the same time, such large, recently-grown manufacturing towns as Birmingham, Leeds, and Manchester had no representation at all in the Commons.

Agitation was begun for the reform of this corrupt and farcical system of representation. The movement was greatly aided and given a more popular character than any earlier reform agitation

by the great newspapers which had come into existence during the latter part of the eighteenth century. The contest between Whigs and Tories, or Liberals and Conservatives, was long and bitter, the Conservatives opposing all reform and denying that there was any necessity for it. The excited state of the public feeling may be inferred from the following description by Lord Macaulay of the scene in the House of Commons upon the passage in that chamber of the first Reform Bill (1831): "Such a scene as the division of last Tuesday," he says, "I never saw, and never expect to see again. . . . It was like seeing Cæsar stabbed in the Senate-house, or seeing Oliver taking the mace from the table; a sight to be seen only once, and never to be forgotten. . . . The ayes and noes were like two volleys of cannon from opposite sides of a field of battle."

At last public feeling became so strong and menacing that the Lords, who were blocking the measure in the Upper House, were forced to yield, and the Reform Bill of 1832 became a law. By this act the English electoral system was radically changed. Eighty-six of the "rotten boroughs" were disfranchised or semi-disfranchised and the hundred and forty-two seats in the Lower House taken from them were given to different counties and to large towns hitherto unrepresented. The bill also somewhat increased the number of electors by extending the right of voting to all persons in the towns owning or leasing property of a certain value, and by lowering the property qualification of voters in the counties.

The importance of this reform bill can hardly be exaggerated. It is the Magna Carta of English political democracy.[1]

[1] The reform of the House of Commons gave an impulse to legislation of an humanitarian and popular character. In 1833 an act was passed in the British Commons for the abolition of slavery. Nearly 800,000 slaves, chiefly in the British West Indies, were freed at a cost to the English nation of £20,000,000. This same year (1833) the first effective Factory Act was passed. This was the beginning of a long series of laws which gradually corrected the almost incredible abuses, particularly in connection with the employment of children, which had crept into the English factory system. A similar series of laws regulated labor in the mines. Also this same year Parliament voted an annual grant of £20,000 to aid in the erection of school-houses. This was the first step taken by the English government in the promotion of

660. The Municipal Reform Act of 1835. — The government of the English towns of this period needed reform as urgently as had the British Parliament. This municipal system was a system inherited from the Middle Ages. Most of the towns were ruled by corrupt oligarchies. Long agitation for their overthrow resulted in the passing of the Municipal Reform Act of 1835. This act accomplished for the government of the cities what the Reform Bill of 1832 had effected for the general government of the kingdom. It transformed the cities from grotesque, iniquitous oligarchies into something like democracies, wherein the government was in the hands of a mayor and a council elected by the townsmen.

661. Chartism: the Revolutionary Year of 1848. — Although the Reform Bill of 1832 was almost revolutionary in the principle it established, still it went only a little way in the application of that principle. It admitted to the franchise the middle classes only. The great laboring class were given no part in the government. They now began an agitation, characterized by much bitterness, known as Chartism, from a document called the "People's Charter," which embodied the reforms they desired. These were "universal suffrage, vote by ballot, annual parliaments, the division of the country into equal electoral districts, the abolition of the property qualification of members, and payment for their services."

The agitation for these changes in the constitution went on with more or less violence until 1848, in which year, encouraged by the revolutions then shaking almost every throne on the European continent, the Chartists indulged in riotous demonstrations, which frightened the law-abiding citizens and brought discredit upon themselves. Their organization now fell to pieces. The reforms, however, which they had labored to secure, were, in the main, desirable and just, and the most important of them have since been adopted and made a part of the English constitution.

public education. In 1846 England, by the repeal of her "corn laws," abandoned the commercial policy of protection, which favored the great landowners, and adopted that of free trade. The chief advocates of this important measure were Richard Cobden and John Bright. The enactment of the law was hastened by the blight of the potato crop in Ireland and consequent famine in the island.

662. The Reform Bill of 1867 and the Education Act of 1870. — The Reform Bill of 1867 was simply another step taken by the English government in the direction of the Reform Bill of 1832. Like that measure, it was passed only after long and violent agitation and discussion both without and within the walls of Parliament. The main effect of the bill was the extension of the right of voting, — the enfranchisement of the great "fourth estate."

As after the Reform Bill of 1832, so now the attention of Parliament was directed to the matter of public instruction; for all recognized that universal education must go along with universal suffrage. Three years after the passage of this second reform bill, Parliament passed an education act (1870) which aimed to provide an elementary education for every child in the British Isles by investing the local authorities with power to establish and maintain schools and compel the attendance of the children.

663. The Reform Bill of 1884. — One of the conservative leaders, the Earl of Derby, in the discussions upon the Reform Bill of 1867, said, "No doubt we are making a great experiment, and taking a leap in the dark." Just seventeen years after the passage of that bill the English people were ready to take another leap. But they were not now leaping in the dark. The wisdom and safety of admitting the lower classes to a share in the government had been demonstrated.

In 1884 Mr. Gladstone, then Prime Minister, introduced and pushed to a successful vote a new reform bill more radical and sweeping in its provisions than any preceding one. It increased the number of voters from about three millions to five millions. The qualification of voters in the counties was made the same as that required of voters in the boroughs. Hence its effect was to enfranchise the great agricultural classes.

A redistribution bill, which was passed in connection with the reform bill, rearranged the electoral districts in such manner that the Commons should more fairly represent the popular will. The number of members from the boroughs was lessened and the number from the counties increased.

664. The Reform of Rural Local Government. — Parliament and the government of the municipalities were now fairly democratized. The rural districts were the last to feel the influence of the liberal movement that was so profoundly reconstructing in the interest of the masses the governmental institutions of the United Kingdom. But the movement finally reached these, and the work of democratic reconstruction has been rounded out and completed by different acts of Parliament,[2] which have put more directly into the hands of the people of each of the smaller subdivisions of the realm the management of their local affairs.

665. Only the Forms of Monarchy remain. — The English government in its local as well as in its national branches is now in reality as democratic as our own. Only the forms of the aristocratic monarchy remain. It does not seem possible that these, in spite of the English love of ancient forms, can always withstand the encroachments of democracy. Hereditary right and privilege, as represented by the House of Lords and the Crown, must in time be abolished. Even now whenever the Lords attempt to thwart the will of the Commons there are ominous threats of abolishing the Upper House, as at present constituted. It seems inevitable that these monarchical and aristocratic forms, representing as they do an old order of things, should give way to purely modern democratic institutions; for, as the advocates of popular self-government maintain, the republic is the logical form of the democratic state.

II. Extension of the Principle of Religious Equality

666. Religious Freedom and Religious Equality. — Alongside the political movement traced in the preceding section ran a similar one in the religious realm. This was a growing recognition by the English people of the true principle of religious toleration.

[2] The most important of these statutes are the Local Government Act of 1888 (for England and Wales), the Local Government Act of 1889 (for Scotland), the Local Government Act of 1898 (for Ireland), and the Parish Council Act of 1894.

At the opening of the nineteenth century there was in England religious freedom, but no religious equality. That is to say, one might be a Catholic or a Protestant dissenter without fear of persecution. Dissent from the Established Church was not unlawful; but one's being a Catholic or a Protestant nonconformist disqualified him from holding certain public offices. Where there exists such discrimination against any religious sect, or where any one sect is favored or sustained by the government, there of course is no religious *equality*, although there may be religious *freedom*.

Progress in this direction, then, will consist in the growth of a really tolerant spirit, which shall lead to the removal of all civil disabilities from Catholics, Protestant dissenters and Jews, and the placing of all sects on an absolute equality before the law.

667. Methodism and its Effects upon Toleration. — One thing that helped to bring prominently forward the question of emancipating nonconformists from the civil disabilities under which they were placed, was the great religious movement known as Methodism (sec. 539). By vastly increasing the body of Protestant dissenters, Methodism gave new strength to the agitation for the repeal of the laws which bore so heavily upon them. So now began a series of legislative acts which made a more and more perfect application of the great principle of religious equality. We shall simply refer to two or three of the most important of these measures.

668. Disabilities removed from Protestant Dissenters (1828). — One of the earliest and most important of the acts of Parliament in this century in recognition of the principle of religious equality was the repeal of the Corporation and Test acts, in so far as they bore upon Protestant dissenters. These were acts passed in the reign of Charles II, which required every officer of a corporation, and all persons holding civil and military positions, to take certain oaths and partake of the communion according to the rites of the Anglican Church. It is true that these laws were not now strictly enforced; nevertheless, the laws were invidious and vexatious, and the Protestant dissenters demanded their repeal.

Those opposed to the repeal argued that the principle of religious toleration did not require it. They insisted that, where every one has perfect freedom of worship, it is no infringement of the principle of toleration for the government to refuse to employ as a public servant one who dissents from the State Church. The result of the debate in Parliament was the repeal of such parts of the ancient acts as it was necessary to rescind in order to relieve Protestant dissenters.

669. **Disabilities removed from the Catholics** (1829). — The bill of 1828 gave no relief to Catholics. They were still excluded from Parliament and various civil offices by the declarations of belief and the oaths required of office holders, — declarations and oaths which no good Catholic could conscientiously make.[3] They now demanded that the same concessions be made them that had been granted Protestant dissenters.

A threatened revolt on the part of the Irish Catholics hurried through Parliament the progress of what was known as the "Catholic Emancipation Act." This law opened Parliament and all the offices of the kingdom, below the Crown, — save that of Regent, of Lord High Chancellor of England and Ireland, of Lord Deputy of Ireland, and a few others, — to the Catholic subjects of the realm.

670. **Disabilities removed from the Jews** (1858). — Persons professing the Jewish religion were still laboring under all the disabilities which had now been removed from Protestant dissenters and Catholics. In 1858 an act (Jewish Relief Act) was passed by Parliament which so changed the oath required of a person taking office — the oath contained the words, "Upon the true faith of a Christian" — as to open all public positions, except a few special offices, to persons of the Jewish faith.

671. **Disestablishment of the Irish Church** (1869). — Forty years after the Catholic Emancipation Act the English government took another great step in the direction of religious equality by the disestablishment of the State Church in Ireland.

[3] In England Catholics were excluded from the privilege of voting as well as from the holding of office.

The Irish have always and steadily refused to accept the religion which their English conquerors have somehow felt constrained to try to force upon them. The vast majority of the people are to-day, and ever have been, Catholics; yet up to the time where we have now arrived these Irish Catholics had been compelled to pay tithes and fees for the maintenance among them of the Anglican Church worship. Meanwhile their own churches, in which the great masses were instructed and cared for spiritually, had to be kept up by voluntary contributions.



FIG. 100. — LORD BEACONSFIELD (DISRAELI), "THE COURTIER PREMIER" (From the monument in Westminster Abbey)

The rank injustice in thus forcing the Irish Catholics to support a Church in which they not only did not believe but which they regarded with special aversion and hatred as the symbol of their subjection and persecution, was perceived and declaimed against by many among the English Protestants themselves.

The proposal to do away with this grievance by the disestablishment of the State Church in Ireland was bitterly opposed by the Conservatives, headed by Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli; but at length, after a memorable debate, the Liberals, under the lead of Bright and Gladstone, the latter then Prime Minister, carried the measure. This was in 1869, but the actual disestablishment was not to take place until the year 1871, at which time the Irish Church, ceasing to exist as a state institution, became a free Episcopal Church. The

historian May pronounces this "the most important ecclesiastical matter since the Reformation."

672. **Proposed Disestablishment of the State Church in England and Scotland.** — The perfect application of the principle of religious equality demands, in the opinion of many English Liberals, the disestablishment of the State Church in England and Scotland.[4] They feel that for the government to maintain any particular sect is to give the state a monopoly in religion. They would have the churches of all denominations placed on an absolute equality. Especially in Scotland is the sentiment in favor of disestablishment very strong.

III. England's Relations with Ireland

673. **Legislative Union of Great Britain and Ireland** (1800). — The history of Ireland in the nineteenth century, like her history in all preceding centuries, is in the main a story of Irish grievances against England. These grievances have for the most part arisen out of three distinct yet closely related subject-matters, — religion, Home Rule, and the land. Concerning the religious grievances of the Irish and their redress we have already spoken in connection with the general religious emancipation movement in England. For an understanding of the subject of Irish Home Rule a glance backward at Irish parliamentary history is necessary.

Ireland, it will be recalled, secured legislative independence of England in 1782 (sec. 542). When, a little later, Napoleon came to the head of affairs in France, there was apprehension on the part of English statesmen lest he should utilize Irish discontent to secure a foothold in the islands. As a measure of precaution the English government resolved to get rid of the Irish Parliament. By wholesale bribery its members were induced to pass a sort of self-denying ordinance whereby the Parliament was abolished, or rather merged with that of Great Britain, Ireland being given representation at Westminster. The two islands were henceforth to bear the name of "The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland."

[4] The Established Church in Scotland is the Presbyterian.

674. Agitation for the Repeal of the Union. — The great body of Irish patriots did not at the time of these transactions admit, nor have they at any time since admitted, the validity of the Act of Union whereby their Parliament was taken from them. In the early forties the agitation for the repeal of the Union and the reëstablishment of their native legislature assumed, under the incitement of the eloquence of the Irish patriot Daniel O'Connell, almost the character of a rebellion. Some years later, in the sixties, the agitation was carried to the point of actual insurrection, but the movement was quickly suppressed and its leaders punished.

675. Gladstone and Home Rule for Ireland. — It was not long before the Irish question was again to the front. In 1886 William Ewart Gladstone became for the third time Prime Minister. Almost his first act was the introduction in the Commons of a Home Rule bill for Ireland. The main feature of this measure was an Irish legislature sitting at Dublin, to which was to be intrusted the management of all exclusively Irish affairs.

The chief arguments urged by the opponents of the bill were that an Irish legislature would deal unfairly with English landlords in Ireland, would oppress the Protestant portion of the population, and, above all, in time of national distress would sever Ireland from the British Empire.

After a long debate the bill was rejected by the Commons (1886). Gladstone appealed to the country. The elections resulted in his defeat. Lord Salisbury became the head of the next cabinet.

The agitation for Irish Home Rule, however, went on. In 1892 the elections resulted in bringing Gladstone to the premiership for the fourth time. He now brought in a new Home Rule bill (1893), which in its essential features was like his first. There followed a long and bitter debate between the partisans of the measure and its opponents. The bill passed the Commons, but was rejected by the House of Lords by an almost unanimous vote.

The following year, owing to the infirmities of advanced age, Gladstone laid down the burdens of the premiership and retired from public life. He died in 1898 at the age of eighty-eight,

and, amidst unusual demonstrations of national grief, was buried in Westminster Abbey. His name has a sure place among the great names in English history.

676. Irish Local Government Bill (1898). — The cause of Irish Home Rule seemed to have descended into the tomb with Gladstone. The Conservative ministry of Lord Salisbury, however, in



FIG. 101. — WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE. (After a painting by *Lenbach*)

1898, hoping to satisfy in a measure Irish demands, enacted a law which created local governing bodies in Ireland, like those which had then recently been established in other parts of the United Kingdom (sec. 664).

The Irish had good reason in this matter to fear the Tories bringing gifts. One purpose of the Conservatives in this piece

of legislation was "to kill Home Rule with kindness"; that is, by the creation of a number of local councils, to induce the Irish to cease their clamor for a general legislature for Ireland.

In 1912 the Government of Ireland Bill, as it was named, was introduced by Mr. Asquith. It provided for a bicameral parliament to sit at Dublin. For two years the bill was bitterly debated both in the Commons and in the House of Lords, amendments were proposed and rejected, and, finally, on May 25, 1914, the unamended bill became law. Later in the year Mr. Asquith's Amendment Act, allowing Ulster counties to decide for themselves whether or not they wished to be under the Dublin Parliament, was passed, but its operation was postponed for one year. But the question was by no means settled, and feeling for and against the bill ran so high in Ireland that civil war seemed imminent. The entrance of Great Britain into the war of 1914 postponed application of the law.

677. Agrarian Troubles and Agrarian Legislation. — It is the opinion of many students of the Irish Question that it is at bottom an economic rather than a political one, and that if Irish economic grievances were removed, the Irish would cease to care for Home Rule.

It is certainly true that very much of Irish misery and discontent arises from absentee landlordism. A great part of the soil of Ireland is owned by a few hundred English proprietors, who represent, in the main, either as heirs or as purchasers, those English and Scotch settlers to whom the lands confiscated from the natives were given at the time of the Cromwellian and other Protestant "settlements" of the island. Before the recent relief legislation, of which we shall speak directly, it was often the case that the agents of these absentee landlords dealt harshly with their tenants and exacted as rent every penny that could be wrung from their poverty. If a tenant made improvements upon the land he tilled, and by ditching and subduing it increased its productive power, straightway his rent was raised. If he failed to pay the higher rent, he was evicted. The records of "evictions" form a sad chapter in the history of the Irish peasantry.

A long series of Irish land laws marks the efforts of the British Parliament to alleviate the distress of the Irish tenant farmers. In 1903 an Irish land-purchase bill, more sweeping and liberal than any preceding measure, was enacted into a law. This law differs from earlier ones in the provision that peasants desiring to buy their holdings shall be aided, not merely by a government loan on long time and low interest, but further by the government itself paying a part of the purchase price. In 1909 the Amendment Land Purchase Act was passed, granting a further sum of £52,000,000 for immediate use and a practically unlimited amount for the future. These liberal measures promise to convert nearly half a million of Irish tenants into proprietors and thus wholly revolutionize the relation of the Irish peasantry to the Irish soil.

Selections from the Sources. — LEE, *Source-Book*, pp. 483–541; KENDALL, *Source-Book*, chaps. xx and xxi; and COLBY, *Selections*, Nos. 113–117. The most important documents for the period will be found in ADAMS and STEPHENS, *Select Documents of English Constitutional History*, pp. 497–555.

Secondary Works. — For Parliamentary reform: MAY, *The Constitutional History of England;* GAMMAGE, *History of the Chartist Movement, 1837–54;* MCCARTHY, *The Epoch of Reform;* CARLYLE, *Chartism;* and DICKINSON, *The Development of Parliament during the Nineteenth Century.*

For Irish matters: LECKY, *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. v, chaps. xii and xiii, for the legislative union of England and Ireland; *Two Centuries of Irish History, 1691–1870*, by different writers, with an Introduction by James Bryce; DICEY, *England's Case against Home Rule;* MCCARTHY, *Ireland since the Union;* and KING, *The Irish Question.*

Biographies: MORLEY, *The Life of Richard Cobden* and *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone.* In the last biography (vol. i, pp. 635–640), read the remarkable letter of young Gladstone to his father on the choice of a profession. BRANDES, *Lord Beaconsfield.* It will hardly be necessary again to remind the reader of the *Dictionary of National Biography.*

For the social, intellectual, and industrial life of the period: TRAILL, *Social England*, vol. vi; and CHEYNEY, *An Introduction to the Social History of England*, chaps. viii–x. For a general review of the events of the period: MCCARTHY, *History of our Own Times.*

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Lord Beaconsfield, the courtier Premier. 2. Gladstone, the Liberal Premier. 3. John Bright, the orator. 4. Daniel O'Connell, the Irish patriot. 5. The potato famine in Ireland. 6. Factory reform.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

SPAIN AND THE REVOLT OF HER AMERICAN COLONIES

678. Effects of Napoleon's Invasion of Spain. — The plan of our work permits us to touch upon only those passages in nineteenth-century Spanish history which, through their relation to the French Revolution or to the general democratic movement since 1815, constitute a part of universal history.

The invasion of Spain by Napoleon in 1808 (sec. 630), wanton as was this attack upon Spanish nationality, resulted ultimately in the destruction there of the old corrupt absolute monarchical system. As an outcome of the national uprising against the French invaders, the country received from the Spanish patriot party a charter of liberty known as the Constitution of 1812. The maxims and principles underlying this instrument were like those embodied in the French Constitution of 1791. This marks the beginning of constitutional government in Spain.

679. The Bourbon Restoration and the Revolution of 1820–1823. — The Restoration of 1814 brought back the Bourbons in the person of Ferdinand VII. Ferdinand was an absolutist. Straightway he set about the restoration of the old régime. He abolished the constitution, dissolved the Cortes or National Assembly, and banished or imprisoned the leaders of the Liberal party. This policy of reaction and repression was met in 1820 by an uprising of the Liberals. The insurgents proclaimed the Constitution of 1812, and forced the king to swear to rule henceforth in accordance with its provisions.

But the absolute sovereigns of Europe would not allow the Spanish people to have a constitutional government. They regarded the setting up of such a system in the peninsula as a menace to their own system of absolutism. They met in

conference[1] and France was assured of the support of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, if she should undertake to suppress the liberal movement. A French army at once crossed the Pyrenees. The constitutional government was overthrown and Ferdinand was restored to his former authority as an absolute ruler.[2]

For ten years the old régime was in force in all its rigor. Thousands of Liberals were immured in dungeons or driven into exile. The monasteries, which had been suppressed during the French régime, were reopened. The Inquisition, which had also been abolished, was reëstablished. The people were forbidden to read foreign books, which were presumably filled with the contagion of democratic ideas.

680. The Revolt of Spain's American Colonies. — At the opening of the nineteenth century Spain's system of government in her over-the-sea dependencies was based on the seventeenth-century maxim that colonies exist for the sake of the mother country. The colonists were forbidden to trade with any country save the home land. All the chief offices in State and Church were filled by persons born in Spain; the creoles, that is Spaniards born in the colonies, were allowed no part in the government. The

[1] During these troubled times the sovereigns of the great powers, either in person or by representatives, met in three celebrated conferences, — the Congress of Troppau (1820), the Congress of Laibach (1821), and the Congress of Verona (1822). It was at the Verona conference that action was taken concerning the state of affairs in Spain. England, jealous of French influence in the peninsula, protested against the proposed intervention, and withdrew from the congress.

[2] The revolution in Spain incited a like movement in Portugal. It will be recalled that when the French invaded Portugal in 1807 the royal family fled to Brazil (sec. 629). The seat of government was not retransferred to the home country in 1815, but Portugal was governed from Brazil as though it were a dependency of the colony. This situation was naturally displeasing to the people of Portugal. In 1820 the dissatisfaction culminated in a revolution. The insurgents proclaimed a liberal constitution. King John VI, urged to return from Brazil, finally set sail for Portugal. Upon his arrival he was constrained to take an oath to observe the new constitution. Then followed a long troubled period. Only since the middle of the nineteenth century can the country be said to have had anything like a regular constitutional government. The country remained a kingdom until 1910. In 1908 King Carlos (whose reign had been filled with tyranny) and the crown prince were murdered in Lisbon. Manuel II succeeded to the throne, but two years later was forced to flee to England, and in 1911 the Portuguese Republic was established, with Manuel Arriaga as its first president.

Indians and half-breeds, who formed the great bulk of the population, were held in a kind of serfdom. Negro slavery prevailed in all the colonies. The Inquisition was maintained in all its rigor. A jealous censorship of the press prevented all free expression of opinion.

This oppressive and arbitrary system of government did not fail to arouse in the colonies a spirit of protest and rebellion. The successful revolt of the English colonies in the North and the French Revolution gave a great impulse to this revolutionary movement in all the Spanish-American countries. The invasion of Spain by the French in 1808 was the signal for insurrection. Taking advantage of the deposition of their king (sec. 630), the colonists rose in revolt, demanding reforms and a share in public affairs. When the Napoleonic Wars ended in 1815 Spain had almost suppressed these insurrections against her authority.

Then came the Restoration which placed the Bourbon Ferdinand VII upon the Spanish throne. Had he made wise concessions to the colonists, they might have been held in their allegiance. Just the opposite course was followed, which resulted in fanning into a fierce flame the smoldering embers of insurrection. The Revolution of 1820 in Spain imparted fresh energy to the outbreak. The aim of the colonists now was not simply a redress of grievances but a severance of all political relations with the mother country.

The details of this war of Spanish colonial independence belong to the special histories of Spain and her colonies. In the next paragraph we shall touch upon only a single international phase of the conflict, which throws a strong side light upon the great struggle at this time going on in Europe between the absolute rulers and the people.

681. The Holy Alliance and the Monroe Doctrine. — The principles of absolutism in government having been asserted anew in Spain,[3] the sovereigns of the Holy Alliance now turned their attention to the New World. They began to discuss the project of aiding Spain to reduce to obedience her rebellious colonies.

[3] And also in Italy (sec. 686).

These deliberations of the absolute sovereigns mark a critical moment in the history of the New World and of the cause of popular self-government. The threatened interference by the Old World monarchies in New World affairs awakened the apprehension of the government of the United States. John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, declared that "if the Holy Alliance subdues Spanish America, the ultimate result of the undertaking will be not to set up the standard of Spain but to portion out the continent among themselves. Russia might take California, Peru, and Chile, and thus make the Pacific a Russian lake."

Such was the situation when in 1823 President Monroe issued his famous message. After referring to the gloomy outlook for Liberalism in the Old World and to the despotic system of government represented by the Holy Alliance, he said: "We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers [the "Holy Allies"], to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

This is the essential part of the celebrated Monroe Doctrine as first formulated. The solemn protest of the United States, supported as it was by the decisive stand of the English government,[4] did not pass unheeded by the continental European sovereigns. The contemplated intervention in the affairs of the Spanish colonies did not take place, and the year 1824 saw all the American dependencies of Spain freed from her oppressive yoke. Fifteen independent republics, embracing fifteen millions of her former subjects, arose on the ruins of her empire.

682. End of Absolute Monarchy in Spain; the Republic of 1873–1874. — Spain was a corner of Europe which was not seriously agitated by the upheavals of the revolutionary year 1830. But there was here as elsewhere an increasing demand by the people for a share in the government. It was in recognition of

[4] The English government disapproved the plan of intervention, partly on account of its dislike of the principles of absolute government and partly on account of English trade interests in the Spanish-American countries.

this growing democratic sentiment that in 1837 the nation was given a revised edition of the Constitution of 1812. This date marks the end of absolute monarchy in Spain.

The matter most worthy of notice in the internal history of Spain as a constitutional state is the establishment in the peninsula of the short-lived Republic of 1873–1874. The leading spirit of this republican movement, and the third President of the commonwealth, was Emilio Castelar, a brilliant orator and a sincere patriot. But the people of Spain were not yet prepared for republican institutions. The republic lasted less than two years. Upon its downfall the monarchy was restored with a liberal constitution.

683. Conclusion. — The century closed in gloom for Spain. In 1898 came the disastrous and humiliating war with the United States, respecting the causes and incidents of which the reader will turn to the later chapters of American history. It will be in place here simply to say that the war resulted in Spain's loss of Cuba and other insular possessions, — almost the last remnants of one of the most extended and magnificent of the colonial empires of modern times.

Selections from the Sources. — HART and CHANNING, *American History Leaflets*, No. 4, "Extracts from Official Declarations of the United States embodying the Monroe Doctrine."

Secondary Works. — HUME, *Modern Spain.* MOSES, *The Establishment of Spanish Rule in America*, chap. xi, "Spain's Economic Policy in America." WINSOR, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, vol. viii, chaps. iv and v. GILMAN, *James Monroe*, chap. vii, "The Monroe Doctrine"; a valuable bibliography of Monroe and the Monroe Doctrine, by Professor J. F. Jameson, forms an appendix to the volume. REDDAWAY, *The Monroe Doctrine.* EDGINGTON, *The Monroe Doctrine.* HANNAY, *Don Emilio Castelar.* LATIMER, *Spain in the Nineteenth Century.*

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The Monroe Doctrine. 2. Simon Bolivar. 3. Emilio Castelar. 4. Don Carlos and the Carlists.

CHAPTER XXXIX

THE LIBERATION AND UNIFICATION OF ITALY

684. Italy at the Downfall of Napoleon. — The Italian peoples, as being the most dangerously infected with the ideas of the Revolution, were, by the reactionary Congress of Vienna, condemned to the most strict and ignominious slavery. The former republics were not allowed to restore their ancient institutions, while the petty principalities were handed over in almost every case to the tyrants or to the heirs of the tyrants who had ruled them before the Revolution.

Austria, as has been stated, appropriated Venetia and Lombardy, and from Northern Italy assumed to direct the affairs of the whole peninsula. "The baton of Metternich," wrote Mazzini, "governs and directs all the petty tyrants of Italy." Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and Lucca were given to princes of the House of Hapsburg. Naples was restored to its old Bourbon rulers. The Pope and Victor Emmanuel I, king of Sardinia (Piedmont), were the only native rulers, but they also were absolutists.

The little republic of San Marino, whose very insignificance had protected it during the changes of the Revolution, was the only patch of free population left in the entire peninsula. The Italians had become a "Helot nation." Italy, in the words of Metternich, was merely a "geographical expression."

But the Revolution had sown the seeds of liberty, and time only was needed for their maturing. The Cisalpine, Ligurian, Parthenopean, and Tiberine republics, short-lived though they were, had awakened in the people an aspiration for self-government; while Napoleon's kingdom of Italy, though equally delusive, had nevertheless inspired thousands of Italian patriots with the sentiment of national unity. Thus the French Revolution, disappointing as

seemed its issue, really imparted to Italy her first impulse in the direction of freedom and national organization.

685. **Arbitrary Rule of the Restored Princes.** — The setting up of the overturned thrones meant, of course, the reinstating of the old tyrannies. The restored despots came back with an implacable hatred of everything French. The liberal constitutions of the revolutionary period were set aside, and all French institutions that were supposed to tend in the least to Liberalism were swept away.

In Sardinia, King Victor Emmanuel I, the "royal Rip Van Winkle," instituted a most extreme reactionary policy. Nothing that bore the French stamp, nothing that had been set up by French hands, was allowed to remain. The monks were given back their monasteries, which had been converted into factories, colleges, and hospitals. The Jesuits were again placed in control of education. Even the French furniture in the royal palace at Turin was thrown out of the windows, and the French plants in the royal gardens were pulled up root and branch. Travel over the Mont Cenis road, constructed by Napoleon, was discouraged, in order that this monument of French genius might be forgotten.

686. **The Carbonari: Uprising of 1820–1821.** — The natural result of the arbitrary rule of the restored princes was deep and widespread discontent. An old secret organization, the members of which were known as the *Carbonari* (charcoal burners), formed the nucleus about which gathered the elements of disaffection.

In 1820, incited by the revolution in Spain, the *Carbonari* raised an insurrection in Naples and forced King Ferdinand to grant his Neapolitan subjects the Spanish Constitution of 1812 (sec. 678). But Prince Metternich, who had been watching the doings of the Neapolitans, interfered to mar their plans. He reasoned that Lombardy and Venetia could be kept free from the contagion of Liberalism only by the stamping out of the infection wherever else in Italy it might show itself. Sixty thousand Austrian troops were sent to crush the revolutionary movement, the liberal constitution was suppressed, Ferdinand was reinstated in his former absolute authority, and everything was put back on the old footing.

Meanwhile a similar revolution was running its course in Piedmont, the aim of which was to secure a liberal constitution for Sardinia and to drive the Austrians out of Lombardy and join it to the Sardinian kingdom. King Victor Emmanuel I, rather than yield to the demands of his people for a constitution, gave up his crown and was succeeded by his brother Charles Felix, a despot by nature, who, by threatening to call to his aid the Austrian army, compelled his subjects to cease their clamor about kings ruling not by the grace of God but by the will of the people.

The suppression of the Liberal uprisings seemed to Metternich the sure pledge of divine favor. He writes exultantly: "I see the dawn of a better day. . . . Heaven seems to will that the world should not be lost."

687. The Revolution of 1830–1831. — For just ten years all Italy lay in sullen vassalage to Austria. Then the revolutionary years of 1830–1831 witnessed a repetition of the scenes of 1820–1821. The revolution in France which placed Louis Philippe upon the French throne sent a tremor of excitement and hope through all Italy. The center of the revolution was the Papal States. The death of the Pope towards the close of the year 1830 appeared to favor the undertaking. In a short time nearly all the territories of the Church were in open revolt, and a resolution of the insurrectionists declared that the temporal rule of the Pope was and by right ought to be forever ended.

But the election of a new Pope, and the presence of Austrian troops, who, "true to their old principle of hurrying with their extinguishers to any spot in Italy where a crater opened," had poured into Central Italy, resulted in the speedy quenching of the flames of the insurrection.

688. The Three Parties. — Twice now had Austrian armies defeated the aspirations of the Italians for national unity and freedom. Italian hatred of these foreign intermeddlers who were causing them to miss their destiny grew ever more intense, and "Death to the Germans!" as the Austrians were called, became the watch cry that united all the peoples of the peninsula.

But while united in their fierce hatred of the Austrians, the Italians were divided in their views respecting the best plan for national organization. One party wanted a confederation of the various states; a second party wished to see Italy a constitutional monarchy with the king of Sardinia at its head; while still a third, known as "Young Italy," wanted a republic.

689. **Joseph Mazzini, the Patriot and Prophet.** — The leader of the third or republican party was the patriot Joseph Mazzini, who played so special a part in the movement for Italy's emancipation and regeneration that we must dwell for a moment upon his personality and work.

Mazzini wished to see Italy freed from foreign domination and the populations of her different provinces united in a strong centralized republic. The means of emancipation and regeneration were to be education and arms.

Mazzini realized that there can be no real and successful Revolution without Renaissance. "Great ideas," he said, "must precede great actions." Hence his aim was to create among the people a new intellectual and moral life. "Tell the people," he said, "of the great past of Italy; tell them of the advantages of liberty and independence; tell them what their brothers are doing in France, in Belgium, in Poland, in Hungary. Point to the Alps and cry, 'Those are Italy's true frontiers; out with the foreigner!'"

Mazzini believed also in the use of bayonets, but only on condition that they have "ideas at their point." Insurrection was to be carried on at first by means of guerrilla bands; then later with regular armies the people would overturn the thrones of the tyrants and set up the republic.

But Mazzini was not a narrow nationalist. He recognized the universal character of the democratic revolution. The people were oppressed not only in Italy but in Spain, in Portugal, in Hungary, in Poland, in Russia, in Turkey, — almost everywhere, in truth. Their cause was a common cause. In opposition to the Holy Alliance of the princes formed with aim to oppress, there must be a Holy Alliance of the peoples formed with aim

to emancipate. The French Revolution, he said, had proclaimed the liberty, equality, and fraternity of individual men; the new revolution should proclaim the liberty, equality, and fraternity of nations.

In this great work of the emancipation and unification of the world, Italy was to be head and guide of the nations. To her this post of leadership was assigned by virtue of her leadership in the past. Italy had not yet consumed her life. She had still a third life to live. Once pagan Rome organized and ruled the world. Then papal Rome organized and ruled it for a thousand years. Now a third world union was to be formed, and of this union of the free and federated nations Italy, Italy as a republic, was to be center and head. The first Rome was the Rome of the Cæsars; the second was the Rome of the Popes; the third was to be the Rome of the Italian People.

Such was Mazzini's interpretation of the drama of world history. Such was his splendid ideal. Through kindling the enthusiasm of the Italian youth, awakening the sentiment of patriotism, and keeping alive the spirit of insurrection Mazzini rendered a great service to the cause of Italian liberation and union.

690. The Revolution of 1848–1849. — After the suppression of the uprising of 1830 until the approach of the memorable year 1848, Italy lay restless under the heel of her oppressor. The republican movements throughout Europe which characterized that year of revolutions encouraged the Italian patriots in another attempt to achieve independence and nationality. Everywhere throughout the peninsula they rose against their despotic rulers and forced them to grant constitutions and institute reforms.

The interest of the conflict centered in North Italy. The Sardinian throne at this time was held by Charles Albert, a true-hearted and zealous patriot, who had just granted his people a liberal constitution (1848), — a constitution which was to become the charter of the liberties of united Italy. Taking advantage of the embarrassment of the Austrian government caused by popular uprisings in all parts of its dominions, Charles Albert declared war against Austria, and straightway flung upon her forces in Lombardy

the Sardinian army, which had been augmented by volunteers from all parts of Italy. At first he was everywhere successful, and Lombardy and Venice both placed themselves under his rule; but finally the veteran Austrian general Radetzky turned the tide of war against him, recovered Lombardy, and, invading Piedmont, inflicted upon the Sardinian army such a defeat (battle of Novara, 1849) that Charles Albert was constrained to resign his crown in favor of his son Victor Emmanuel II, who, he hoped, would be able to secure more advantageous terms from the victorious Austrians than he himself could expect to obtain.

FIG. 102. — VICTOR EMMANUEL II. (From an engraving)

Meanwhile the Romans had risen, proclaimed the Republic, and driven out the Pope, Pius IX. But the new Tiberine Republic was soon overthrown by the troops of the French Republic, just recently set up (sec. 653), and the Pope was reinstated in his authority. This interference by the French in Italian affairs was prompted by their jealousy of Austria and the desire of Louis Napoleon to win the good will of the Catholic clergy in France. Thus through the intervention of foreigners was the third Italian revolution brought to naught.

691. Victor Emmanuel II, Count Cavour, and Garibaldi. — We have just noticed the accession to the Sardinian throne of Victor Emmanuel II as a constitutional ruler, — the only one remaining in Italy. Austria had tried to get him to repeal the constitution his father had granted, but he had resolutely refused to do so. To him it was that the hopes of the Italian patriots now turned. Nor were these hopes to be disappointed. Victor Emmanuel was the destined liberator of Italy, or perhaps it would be more correct to say that his was the name in which the achievement was to be effected by the wise policy of his great minister Count Cavour and the reckless daring of the national hero Garibaldi.

Count Cavour was the Bismarck of Italy, — one of those great men who during this formative period in the life of the European peoples have earned the title of Nation Makers. He was lacking in oratorical and poetic gifts. "I cannot make a sonnet," he said, "but I can make Italy," — an utterance suggested doubtless by that of the Athenian statesman (Themistocles) who boasted that though "he knew nothing of music and song, he did know how of a mean city to make a great one." Cavour was the real maker of modern Italy.

FIG. 103. — COUNT CAVOUR
(From an engraving)

Garibaldi, "the hero of the red shirt," the knight-errant of Italian independence, was a most remarkable character. Though yet barely past middle life, he had led a career singularly crowded with varied experiences and romantic adventures. Because of his violent republicanism he had already been twice exiled from Italy.

692. Sardinia in the Crimean War. — In 1855, in pursuance of a far-sighted policy, Cavour sent a Sardinian contingent of fifteen thousand men to aid England and France against Russia in the Crimean War (sec. 722), with the two chief aims of giving Sardinia a standing among the powers of Europe, and of earning the gratitude of England and France, so that the Italians in their future struggles with Austria might not have to fight their battles alone.

A little incident in the trenches of the allies before Sevastopol shows in what spirit the Sardinians had gone to the war. A soldier, covered with mud and wearied with the everlasting digging, complained to his superior officer. "Never mind," was the consoling reply; "it is with this mud that Italy is to be made."

693. Cavour prepares for War with Austria. — After the Peace of Paris, which closed the Crimean War, Cavour continued the vigorous domestic policy which he had adopted for Sardinia with

the aim of developing her material resources and thus preparing her for great exertions. The most notable undertaking which he persuaded the Sardinian government to enter upon was the tunneling of the Alps beneath Mt. Cenis, in order that Sardinia might be brought into commercial intercourse with the north of Europe. "If we are to become great," he said, "we must do this. The Alps must come down."

Another part of Cavour's policy was to cultivate the friendship of the French Emperor Napoleon III. In a secret meeting with the Emperor he received from him a promise that a French army would, when the favorable moment arrived, aid the Sardinians in driving the Austrians out of Italy. In this proffer of help the French Emperor was actuated less by gratitude for the aid of the Sardinian contingent in the Crimean War than by a desire to lessen the power of Austria in Italy and to replace it by French influence, and to secure Savoy and Nice, which were to be France's reward for her intervention in Sardinia's behalf.

694. **The Austro-Sardinian War** (1859–1860). — The hour for striking another blow for the freedom of Italy had now arrived. Sardinia began to arm. Austria, alarmed at these demonstrations, called upon Sardinia to disarm immediately upon threat of war. Cavour eagerly accepted the challenge.

The French armies were now joined to those of Sardinia. The two great victories of Magenta and Solferino drove the Austrians out of Lombardy and behind the famous Quadrilateral, consisting of four strong fortresses, which sheltered Venetia. Just at this juncture the menacing attitude of Prussia and other German states, which were alarmed at the prospective aggrandizement of France, and the rapid spread of the revolutionary movement in Italy, which foreshadowed the union of all the states of the peninsula in a single kingdom, — something which Louis Napoleon did not wish to see consummated,[1] — this new situation of things, in connection with

[1] Napoleon III did not wish for a united Italy any more than he wished for a united Germany. His aim was to create a kingdom in Northern Italy which would exclude Austria from the peninsula and then to bring about a confederation of all the Italian states under the presidency of the Pope. Italy thus reconstructed would, he conceived, be fain to look to the French Emperor as her champion and patriot.

GERMAN FEDERATION
SWITZERLAND
EMPIRE OF AUSTRIA
FRANCE
Danube
KINGDOM OF HUNGARY
KINGDOM OF LOMBARDY-VENETIA
PIEDMONT
SARDINIA
TURKEY
Adriatic Sea
GRAND DUCHY OF TUSCANY
STATES OF THE CHURCH
Umbria
Corsica
(To France)
SARDINIA
Part of Kingdom of Sardinia
TYRRHENIAN SEA
KINGDOM OF TWO SICILIES
SICILY
AFRICA
Malta
(To Great Britain)
Bormio
Chiavenna
Trent
Udine
Varese
Como
Bergamo
Brescia
Milan
Verona
Vicenza
Venice
Padua
Mantua
Piacenza
Parma
Modena
Reggio
Ferrara
Rovigo
Bologna
Comacchio
Ravenna
Forli
Imola
Ancona
Pesaro
Urbino
Lucca
Florence
Arezzo
Siena
Perugia
Orvieto
Viterbo
Civita Vecchia
Rome
Velletri
Gaeta
Aquila
Spoleto
Foggia
Barletta
Trani
Bari
Capua
Benevento
Naples
Salerno
Tarante
Otranto
La Maddalena I.
Caprera I.
Cagliari
Trapani
Palermo
Messina
Milazzo
Reggio
Marsala
Calatafimi
Girgenti
Catania
Syracusa
Sicily
Calabria
Ceded to France 1860
Ceded to France 1814
Nice
Monaco
Genoa
Savoy
ITALY
1814-1859
0 50 100
Scale of Miles
6 W. & N. ENG., BUFFALO 10
12 Longitude East 14 from Greenwich 16

other considerations, caused the French Emperor to draw back and to enter upon negotiations of peace with the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph at Villafranca.

The outcome was that Austria retained Venice but gave up to Sardinia the larger part of Lombardy. The Sardinians were bitterly disappointed that they did not get Venetia, and loudly accused the French Emperor of having betrayed their cause, since at the outset he had promised them that he would free Italy from the "Alps to the Adriatic."

But Sardinia found compensation for Venice in the accession of Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and the Romagna, the peoples of which states, having discarded their old rulers, besought Victor Emmanuel to permit them to unite themselves to his kingdom. Thus, as the result of the war, the king of Sardinia had added to his subjects a population of seven millions. A long step had been taken in the way of Italian unity and freedom.

But while the Sardinian kingdom was thus vastly extended to the east and to the south, it was cut away a little on the west. Savoy and Nice, the former "the cradle of the Savoyard House," were given, according to previous agreement, as the price of her services, to France.

695. Sicily and Naples, with Umbria and the Marches, added to Victor Emmanuel's Kingdom (1860). — The adventurous daring of the hero Garibaldi now added Sicily and Naples, and indirectly Umbria and the Marches, to the possessions of Victor Emmanuel, and changed the kingdom of Sardinia into the kingdom of Italy.

These momentous events took place under the following circumstances. In 1860 the subjects of the Bourbon Francis II, king of the Two Sicilies, rose in revolt. Victor Emmanuel and his minister Cavour were in sympathy with the movement, yet dared not send the insurgents aid through fear that such action would arouse the jealousy of Austria and of France. But Garibaldi, untrammeled by any such considerations and favored by the connivance of the Sardinian government, having gathered a band of a thousand volunteers, set sail from Genoa for Sicily, where upon landing he assumed the title of Dictator of Sicily for

Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, and quickly drove the troops of King Francis out of the island. Then crossing to the mainland he marched triumphantly to Naples, whose inhabitants hailed him tumultuously as their deliverer.

But Garibaldi's rashness was creating a situation which threatened to bring about intervention by France and Austria, and perhaps by other powers. Count Cavour saw that the time had come for the Sardinian government to assume guidance of the revolutionary movement. The papal territories of Umbria and the Marches were accordingly occupied by a Sardinian army, which then marched southward and, by the capture after a long siege of the Neapolitan stronghold of Gaeta, completed the work of the Garibaldian volunteers. Meanwhile, a plebiscite, or popular vote, having been ordered, Umbria, the Marches, Naples, and Sicily voted almost unanimously for annexation to the Sardinian kingdom.



FIG. 104. — GARIBALDI. (From an engraving)

Thus was another long step taken in the unification of Italy. Nine millions more of Italians had become the subjects of Victor Emmanuel. There was now wanting to the complete union of Italy only Venetia and Rome with the lands in the immediate neighborhood of the city, known as the "Patrimony of Saint Peter."

696. Venetia added to the Kingdom (1866). — The Seven Weeks' War (sec. 710), which broke out between Prussia and Austria in 1866, afforded the Italian patriots the opportunity for which they were watching to make Venetia a part of the kingdom of Italy. Victor Emmanuel formed an alliance with the king of Prussia, one of the conditions of which was that no peace should be made with Austria until she had surrendered Venetia to Italy.

The issue of the war gave this territory to the kingdom of Italy. Rome and some Italian lands[2] on the northeastern frontier were all now lacking to complete the unification of the peninsula.

697. Rome becomes the Capital (1870). — After the liberation of Naples and Sicily the city of Turin, the old capital of the Sardinian kingdom, was made the capital of the new kingdom of Italy. In 1865 the seat of government was transferred to Florence. But the Italians looked forward to the time when Rome, the ancient mistress of the peninsula and of the world, should be their capital. The power of the Pope, however, was upheld by the French, who maintained a garrison in the Papal States from 1849 to 1870, and this made it impossible for the Italians to have their will in this matter without a conflict with France.

But events soon gave the coveted capital to the Italian government. In 1870 came the sharp, quick war between France and Prussia, and the French troops at Rome were hastily summoned home. Upon the overthrow of the French Empire and the establishment of the republic, Victor Emmanuel was informed that France would no longer sustain the papal power. The Italian government at once gave notice to the Pope that Rome would henceforth be considered a portion of the kingdom of Italy, and forthwith an Italian army entered the city, which by a vote of almost a hundred to one[3] resolved to cast in its lot with that of the Italian nation.

The family was now complete. Italy was a nation — and the only great nation in Europe "made not by conquest but by consent." July 2, 1871, Victor Emmanuel himself entered Rome and took up his official residence there. Since then the Eternal City has been the seat of the national government, — the capital of a free and united Italy.[4]

[2] The Trentino and Trieste. It was chiefly to liberate these lands from Austrian domination that Italy entered the great war in 1915 on the side of the nations fighting against the Central Powers (see Supplemental Chapter XLV, sec. 783).

[3] Exactly 133,681 to 1507.

[4] Victor Emmanuel II died in 1878, and his son came to the throne with the title of Humbert I. He was assassinated in 1900, and was succeeded by his only son, Victor Emmanuel III.

698. End of the Temporal Power of the Papacy. — The occupation of Rome by the Italian government marked the end of the temporal power of the Pope, and the end of an ecclesiastical state, the last in Europe, which from long before Charlemagne had held a place among the temporal powers of Europe, and during all that period had been a potent factor in the political affairs not only of Italy but of almost the whole continent. The papal troops, with the exception of a few guardsmen, were disbanded. The Vatican palace and some other buildings with their grounds were reserved to the Pope as a place of residence, together with a yearly allowance of over six million dollars. By a statute known as the Law of the Papal Guarantees (1871), the Pope was secured in the free exercise of his spiritual functions.

These arrangements have subsisted down to the present time. Under them the Pope is not to be regarded as a subject of the Italian government but rather as a sovereign residing at Rome. Like a sovereign he has the right to send and to receive embassies. His person is inviolable. No Italian officer may enter the Vatican or its grounds, which the Italian government respects the same as though they were foreign territory.[5]

699. The Vatican and the Quirinal:[6] the Roman Question. — The popes[7] have steadily refused to recognize the legitimacy of the act whereby they were deprived of the temporal government of Rome and the Papal States, and have protested against it by refraining from setting foot outside the gardens of the Vatican, by refusing to accept the annuity provided for them, and in various other ways.

[5] It is a matter worthy of note that just a few months before the loss of his temporal sovereignty a great ecumenical council of the Catholic Church (the Vatican Council of 1869–1870) had by a solemn vote proclaimed the doctrine of papal infallibility, which declares the decisions of the Pope, when speaking *ex cathedra*, "on questions of faith and morals," to be infallible.

[6] The Palace of the Quirinal at Rome contains the offices of the Italian government, and thus the term *Quirinal* typifies the secular as the term *Vatican* typifies the spiritual power in Italy.

[7] Pius IX died in 1878 and was followed in the pontificate by Leo XIII, who died July 20, 1903, at the patriarchal age of ninety-three, after having won a place among the greatest and the best of the popes. He was succeeded by Pius X, who died in 1914, and who was followed by Benedict XV.

The partisans of the Papacy maintain that the act of dispossession was an act of impious spoliation, and that there can be no settlement of the Roman Question save through the restoration of the Pope to his former status as an independent temporal sovereign. They contend that only through the possession of temporal power can the Pope be secure in his independence as the spiritual head of Catholic Christendom. They demand, therefore, the retrocession to the holy see of at least the city of Rome, — maintaining that either Turin or Florence or Venice or Naples would serve as well as Rome for the seat of the Italian government.

FIG. 105. — POPE PIUS X. (From a photograph)

To these censures and demands of the papal party the friends of the monarchy reply that the extension of the authority of the Italian government over Rome and the papal territories was justified by the modern principle of nationality, which recognizes in every people the right to choose their form of government and to shape their own destiny. As to the removal of the seat of the Italian government from Rome to some other city of the peninsula, they maintain that the force of unique historical associations, and race traditions and memories, make Rome the logical and inevitable capital of a united Italy.

The long and heated controversy has had lamentable consequences for Italy. It has called into existence two bitterly hostile parties; it has hampered the Italian government in many of its policies of reform; and at different times it has even imperiled the very existence of the monarchy.

700. **Doubtful National Policies; Reform and Progress.** — Other things have concurred with the antagonism between the Vatican and the Quirinal to retard Italy's progress under the new régime. Among these hindrances may be reckoned an ill-advised colonial policy (sec. 738, n. 19) and an unfortunate yet natural ambition to play the rôle of a great European power, both of which have caused the government to neglect domestic concerns and to burden the country with the maintenance of an army and a navy altogether disproportioned to its needs and to its strength.

Yet, notwithstanding these hindrances to national progress, very much has been accomplished since the winning of independence and nationality. Brigandage, an element of the bad heritage from the time of servitude, oppression, and disunion, has been in a great degree suppressed; railways have been built; the Alps have been tunneled; the healthfulness of the Campagna and other districts has been increased by extensive systems of drainage, and regions long given over to desolation have been made habitable and productive; the dense ignorance and the deep moral degradation of the masses, particularly in the southern parts of the peninsula, — another element of the evil inheritance from the past, — have been in a measure overcome and relieved by a public system of education; and Rome has been rebuilt, and from the position of a mean provincial town raised to a place among the great capitals of modern Europe.

As to the progress made during the last thirty years in the development of the sentiment of nationality, upon the strength of which depends the peace, permanency, and prosperity of the new kingdom of Italy, a recent disaster furnishes a milestone by which to measure advance. In 1902 the great historic campanile which dominated St. Mark's in Venice (see Plate II), fell in a pathetic heap of ruins. Every city of the peninsula, says a

chronicler of the event, mourned just as if the tower had been its own, — "and then they opened a subscription." Had the catastrophe happened a single generation ago Venice would have had to restore her own bell tower; but Italy is to-day a Nation, and the misfortune which befalls any Italian city afflicts all alike.

Selections from the Sources. — MAZZINI, *Life and Writings.* Should be read by all those whose souls, to use one of Mazzini's own phrases, need to be retempered in abhorrence of tyranny. DELLA ROCCA, *The Autobiography of a Veteran, 1807–1893.* A narrative of simplicity and charm.

Secondary Works. — PROBYN, *Italy: from the Fall of Napoleon I, in 1815, to the Year 1890,* and STILLMAN, *The Union of Italy, 1815–1895.* The first of these affords the best short account for young readers; the second is the best for a careful study. MARTINENGO CESARESCO, *The Liberation of Italy, 1815–1870;* also by the same writer, *Cavour.* THAYER, *The Dawn of Italian Independence.* MAZADE, *Life of Cavour.* DICEY, *Victor Emmanuel.* KING, *Mazzini.* VENTURI, *Joseph Mazzini.* GALLENGA, *The Pope and the King; The War between Church and State in Italy.*

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The little republic of San Marino. 2. Joseph Mazzini. 3. Count Cavour. 4. The Mont Cenis tunnel 5. The Quirinal and the Vatican.

CHAPTER XL

THE MAKING OF THE NEW GERMAN EMPIRE

701. Formation of the German Confederation (1815). — The creation of the new German Empire is the most important matter in the political history of Europe since Waterloo. The story of this great achievement affords a most instructive commentary upon the outworkings of the principles of the Revolution, — the principles of popular sovereignty and nationality. It tells how nearly forty autocratically governed and practically sovereign states, German in speech and blood, which had been long separated by the policy of their divine-right rulers or by the circumstances of history, won constitutions embodying at least the rudiments of self-government, and were welded by force of arms and sentiment into a powerful state.

This story begins with the Congress of Vienna.[1] That body reorganized Germany as a Confederation, with the Emperor of Austria as President of the league. The union consisted of the Austrian Empire, and the four kingdoms of Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, and Würtemberg, besides various principalities and free cities, — in all, thirty-nine states. A Diet formed of delegates from the several states, and sitting at Frankfort-on-the-Main, was to settle all questions of dispute arising between members of the Confederation, and to determine matters of general concern. In all matters concerning itself alone, each state was to retain its independence. It might carry on war with foreign states or enter into alliance with them, but it must do nothing to harm the Confederation or any member of it.

The articles of union, in a spirit of concession to the growing sentiment of the times, provided that all sects of Christians should

[1] For a word as to how Napoleon's reconstruction of the Germanic body laid the basis of German unity, see sec. 621.

enjoy equal toleration, and that every state should establish a representative form of government.

702. Defects and Weaknesses of the Confederation. — The ties uniting the various states of this Confederation could hardly have been more lax. There was no central authority to enforce decrees, nor a written constitution to define its powers. One chief defect of the constitution of the league lurked in the provisions concerning the Federal Diet. The unwillingness of the several states to surrender any part of their sovereignty had led to the insertion of the rule that no measure of first importance should be adopted by the Diet save by a unanimous vote. The inevitable result of this provision was that no measure of first importance was ever passed by the assembly, which became throughout Europe a byword for hopeless inefficiency.

Another defect in the federal government was that, because of the lack of centralized power, there existed no effective machinery for carrying out the acts of the Federal Diet. These amounted practically to nothing more than recommendations to the rulers of the several states, who paid no heed whatsoever to them unless they chanced to be in line with their own policies or inclinations.

But what contributed more than all else to render the federal scheme wholly unworkable was the presence in the league of two powerful and mutually jealous states, Austria and Prussia, neither of which was willing that the other should have predominance in the affairs of the Confederation.

Of these two rival states Prussia, though at first she yielded nominal precedence to Austria, which had a great past and enjoyed a vast prestige at the European courts, was in reality the stronger and the more promising state. Her strength lay particularly in the essentially unified character of her population. Austria was inherently weak because of the mixed antagonistic elements in most of the territories that had been gradually united under the rule of the Hapsburgs. The greater part of their lands lay outside of the German Confederation and contained nearly twenty-five million Slavs, Magyars, Italians, and other non-German subjects.

This difference in the character of the populations of Prussia and the Austrian Empire foreshadowed their divergent destinies, — foreshadowed that Austria should lose and that Prussia should gain the leadership in German affairs.

703. The Dual Movement towards Freedom and Union; Metternich and the Absolutist Reaction. — For a half century after the Congress of Vienna the history of Germany is the history of a dual movement, or perhaps it would be better to say two movements, one democratic and the other national in character. The aim of the first movement was the establishment of representative government in the different states of the Confederation; the aim of the second was German unity. These movements were essentially the same as those which we have seen creating in the Italian peninsula a free and united Italy. By what methods they were carried on and in what measure their aims were attained will appear in the following pages.

It was the democratic sentiment, the desire for free institutions, which first made itself felt. Several of the princes of the smaller states, in particular of those states along the Rhine which had been most directly under French influence, yielding to the popular demand, granted their subjects constitutions or created representative bodies of limited powers.

Metternich, who controlled the policies of the Austrian government, did not approve of the action of these liberal-minded rulers. He bade them remember that all the terrible trouble in France had begun with the assembling of the States-General, and solemnly adjured them not to commit such an unpardonable error as Louis XVI committed in allowing that body to come together. Several of the princes who had instituted representative government were frightened into withdrawing the constitutions they had granted and were persuaded to return to the safe and tried system of government by the sole will of the sovereign.

704. The Revolutions of 1830: Some Gains for Constitutional Government. — We have seen what were the consequences of the reactionary policy of the Bourbons in France and of the despots in Italy. Events ran exactly the same course in Germany. When

the news of the July Revolution in Paris spread beyond the Rhine, a sympathetic thrill shot through Germany, and in places the Liberal party made threatening demonstrations against their reactionary rulers. In several of the minor states constitutions were granted.

Thus a little was gained for parliamentary government, though after the flutter of the revolutionary years the princes again took up their reactionary policy, and under the influence of Metternich did all in their power to check the popular movement and to keep governmental matters out of the hands of the people.

705. **Formation of the Customs Union; First Step towards German Unity** (1828–1836). — It was just at this revolutionary epoch that the first step was taken in the formation of a real German nation. Under the Act of Confederation of 1815 the members of the Germanic body were situated in respect to interstate trade almost as separate countries rather than as integral parts of the same country. It was the necessity of some general regulations in regard to commerce that impelled the American states to form a closer union; it was the same necessity which now led the loosely confederated states of Germany to enter into an arrangement known as the *Zollverein*, or Customs Union. This was a sort of commercial treaty binding those states that became parties to it — by the year 1836 almost all the states of the Confederation save Austria had become members of the league — to adopt among themselves the policy of free trade; that is, there were to be no duties levied on goods passing from one state of the Union to another belonging to it.

The greatest good resulting from the Union was that it taught the people to think of a more perfect national union. And as Prussia was the promoter of the trade confederation, it accustomed the smaller states to look to her as their head and chief.

706. **The Uprisings of 1848; Further Gains for Constitutional Government.** — The history of Germany from the uprising of 1830 to that of 1848 may be summarized by saying that during all these years the people were steadily growing more and more earnest in their demands for liberal forms of government, while

most of the princes, strangely blind to the spirit and tendency of the times, were stubbornly refusing all concessions that should take from them any of their power as absolute rulers. In some instances the constitutions already granted were annulled or their articles were disregarded.

Finally, in 1848, news flew across the Rhine of the uprising in France against the reactionary government of Louis Philippe, and of the establishment by the French people of a new republic. The intelligence kindled a flame of excitement throughout Germany. The Liberals everywhere arose and demanded constitutional government. Almost all the princes of the minor states yielded to the popular clamor and straightway adopted the liberal measures and instituted the reforms demanded. In Austria and Prussia, however, the party of reform carried their point only after demonstrations that issued in bloodshed.

Especially in Austria did affairs at this epoch assume a most threatening aspect.[2] Metternich was obliged to flee the country. He went to England, whither Louis Philippe had just preceded him. The Emperor Ferdinand I abdicated in favor of his nephew Francis Joseph (Dec. 2, 1848), who granted the people a constitution and assented to the calling of a national assembly to be formed of representatives from all his hereditary dominions, chosen by popular vote.[3]

At the Prussian capital Berlin there was serious fighting in the streets between the people and the soldiers, and the excitement was not quieted until the king, Frederick William IV, assured the people that their demands for constitutional government should be granted. In fulfillment of this promise the king granted a constitution and took an oath to rule in accord with its provisions (Feb. 6, 1850). Prussia thus joined the ranks of constitutional states. This state was now to play in the unification of

[2] The most serious trouble was in Hungary. Led by the distinguished statesman and orator Louis Kossuth, the Hungarians rose in revolt and declared their independence of the Austrian crown (April 14, 1849). They made a noble fight for freedom, but were overpowered by the united Austrian and Russian armies. Kossuth escaped into Turkey. He died in exile at Turin in 1894.

[3] The Austrian constitution was withdrawn in 1851.

Germany a part like that played by the constitutional state of Piedmont in the unification of Italy. Henceforth Prussian history is German history.[4]

707. Bismarck, the Unifier of Germany. — In the year 1861 Frederick William IV of Prussia died, and his brother, already an old man of sixty-three yet destined to be for almost a generation the central figure in the movement for German unity, came to the Prussian throne as William I. He soon called to his side Otto von Bismarck as Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs. Bismarck's appearance at the head of the Prussian government marks an epoch in history. "With that day," writes Sybel, speaking of Bismarck's accession to power, "a new era did in truth begin for Prussia and Germany and so for Europe." What the character of this era was to be, and what the result not only for Germany but for the world, of Bismarck's unscrupulous diplomacy and method of empire-building, the records of the decades before us will disclose.

Bismarck contended that it was Prussia's mission to effect the unification of the German people. This work he was convinced could be accomplished only through the Prussian royal house. Hence he was a royalist, in truth almost an absolutist. Following this policy to its extreme limits, he developed the royal power in Prussia to an extremely dangerous degree. This unhampered absolutism he maintained would be the one instrument by means of which German unity could be created. This conviction determined Bismarck's attitude towards the Prussian Parliament when it came in conflict with the royal power. He flouted it and trampled it under foot. He was known as the "Parliament tamer." Naturally he was distrusted and hated by the Liberals.

Bismarck saw clearly enough how the vexed question between Austria and Prussia was to be settled, — "by blood and iron."

[4] About this same time the growing desire for German nationality expressed itself in an attempt to bind the German states in a closer union by means of a real national parliament to take the place of the inefficient Diet created by the Act of Confederation in 1815. To this end there met in Frankfort, May 18, 1848, a Constituent Assembly, the members of which had been elected in the different states by popular vote, which, like the Constituent Assembly of 1789 in France, was charged with the duty of framing a national constitution for the German states. Nothing was accomplished by the meeting.

Austria's power and influence must be destroyed and she herself forcibly expelled from Germany before the German states could be remolded into a real national union.

708. The Reform of the Prussian Army; Bismarck's Conflict with the Prussian Parliament. — It had been King William's policy to reform and strengthen the Prussian army. He had selected Bismarck as his prime minister because he knew he would carry out this policy in the face of the opposition of the Prussian House of Representatives. That body would not vote the necessary taxes. Bismarck held that it was their duty to make the necessary appropriations for the army, and when they persisted in withholding grants of money he, backed by his sovereign and the House of Lords, raised without parliamentary sanction what money he needed for his army reforms.

It was a bold and dangerous procedure, and one that had been unsuccessfully attempted in other kingdoms under similar circumstances. Fortunately for King William and his imperious minister the policy proved highly successful in Germany, issuing in Prussia's predominance and in German unity; and the "Parliament tamer" and his master remained in power.

709. The Schleswig-Holstein War (1864). — The weapon which Bismarck had forged was used in three wars. The first of these was the Schleswig-Holstein War. Holstein was a small duchy that had at various times been held as a part of Germany and of Denmark. In 1863, while it was regarded as a part of the latter kingdom, Frederick VII of Denmark died and the male line of the royal family became extinct. Germany now maintained that this duchy, and also Schleswig (for an old treaty was regarded as having made the duchies inseparable), should become entirely free of the Danish crown, since Holstein did not acknowledge the right of female succession to the crown. The dispute soon ripened into war between Austria and Prussia and the new Danish king, Christian IX. Denmark was overpowered and forced to resign her claims to the duchies.

Straightway the duchies became a bone of contention between Austria and Prussia. Bismarck was bent on annexing them to

Prussia, since they would be a most valuable possession for her as a prospective sea power, giving her as they would the harbor of Kiel and control of a proposed canal uniting the Baltic and the North Sea.* Austria was determined that her rival should not get them unless she received valuable compensation in some form, — a bit of Silesia perhaps, or the promise of Prussia's help in case she had difficulty with her troublesome non-German provinces.

There was endless controversy over the matter. Bismarck realized that Prussia could secure the coveted prize only through war with Austria, and to this extreme he was ready to go, since a war would settle not only the question respecting the ownership of the duchies but also the larger question as to Austrian or Prussian predominance in Germany. The hopelessly entangled Gordian knot was to be cut by the sword.

710. The Austro-Prussian, or Seven Weeks', War (1866). — Both Austria and Prussia began to arm. Bismarck secured the neutrality of France by permitting the Emperor Napoleon to believe that if Prussia secured additional territory by the war, France would be allowed to appropriate Belgium or some Rhenish lands as a compensation.

He also made a ready ally of Italy by engaging that in the event of a successful issue of the war the new Italian kingdom should in return for its alliance receive Venetia, which, it will be recalled, was at this time still lacking to complete the unification of Italy (sec. 695).

Bids in the form of various proposals and promises were also made by Bismarck for the alliance of the smaller German states; but almost all ranged themselves on the side of Austria, so that, notwithstanding the advantage gained by the Italian alliance, it seemed like an unequal contest into which Prussia was venturing, since her population was not more than a third of that of the states which were likely to be arrayed against her. This disadvantage was more than offset, however, by the preparations for war made by Bismarck, who had long foreseen the struggle.

* This canal was completed and opened in 1895.

The war was carried on at once in three quarters, — in the South German states, in the Austrian territory of Bohemia, and in Italy. We need follow only the campaign in Bohemia. Here on the 3d of July, 1866, was fought the great battle of Sadowa, or Königgrätz, in which two hundred and twenty-two thousand Austrians were engaged with two hundred and twenty-one thousand Prussians. This was one of the great and decisive battles of history. It was Austria's Waterloo. The Prussians pushing on towards Vienna, the Emperor Francis Joseph was constrained to sue for peace, and on the 23d of August the Treaty of Prague was signed.[5]

The long debate between Austria and Prussia was over. By the terms of the treaty Austria consented to the dissolution of the old German Confederation and agreed to allow Prussia to reorganize the German states as she might wish. At the same time she surrendered Venetia to the Italian kingdom. The hindrances she had so long placed in the way both of German and of Italian unity were now finally removed.

711. Establishment of the North German Confederation (1867). — Now quickly followed the reorganization under the presidency of Prussia of the German states north of the Main into what was called the North German Confederation. There were twenty-one states in all, reckoning the three free cities of Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck. The domains of Prussia were enlarged by the annexation of Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, the free city Frankfort, and the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. These annexations gave the Prussian king nearly five million new subjects and united into a fairly compact dominion his heretofore severed and scattered territories.

A constitution was adopted which provided that all common concerns should be committed to a Federal Parliament or Diet, the members of the lower house of which were to be chosen by

[5] Since as the price of his consent to Italian unity the Emperor Napoleon had received Savoy and Nice (sec. 694), so now he hoped to obtain from Germany some Rhine lands as the price of his consent to German unity. This had caused the Prussian court to hasten the peace negotiations.

universal suffrage in the different states. The Prussian king was to be the hereditary executive of the Confederation, and the commander-in-chief of all the military forces of the several states.

Thus was a long step taken towards German unity. Bismarck's purposely rough and brutal policy of "blood and iron" appeared at the time to benefit most of Germany's troubles. Though so much had been effected, there was still remaining much to be desired. The states to the south of the Main — Baden, Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Hesse-Darmstadt — were yet wanting to complete the unification of the Empire.

What had kept these South German states from joining the new union was not only their reluctance to entering a confederation dominated by Prussia but also the opposition of the French Emperor Napoleon III, who had insisted that the river Main should form the southern boundary of the Confederation of the North. He had thought that the South German states would form a union among themselves and look to him as their champion against Prussian aggression.

712. The Franco-Prussian War (1870–1871). — The Austro-Prussian War had laid the basis of a Franco-Prussian War. It has just been seen how German unity had come short of complete accomplishment partly through the interference of the Emperor Napoleon. But it was intolerable to the German people, since the sentiment of German nationality was growing stronger, that France should be allowed to dictate to Germans respecting their internal affairs, and should stand between them and their national destiny.

On the other hand, it seemed intolerable to the French that a strong German Empire should be allowed to arise right on the frontier of France, and that this new upstart power should shoulder France from her historic position as arbiter of Europe. All France's justifiable dislike of the House of Hapsburg was now transferred to the rising House of Hohenzollern. She watched with uneasiness the approaching consummation of German unity under Prussian leadership. Relations were so strained between the two nations that war seemed unavoidable.

It was not long in coming. In 1869 the throne of Spain became vacant. It was offered to Leopold, a member of the Hohenzollern family. The Emperor Napoleon III believed he saw in this a scheme on the part of the House of Hohenzollern to unite the interests of Prussia and Spain, just as Austria and Spain were united, with such disastrous consequences to the peace of Europe, under the princes of the House of Hapsburg. Even after Leopold, to avoid displeasing France, had declined the proffered crown, the Emperor Napoleon demanded of King William assurance that no member of the House of Hohenzollern should ever with his consent become a candidate for the Spanish throne.

This demand was made of King William by the French ambassador Benedetti at the little watering place of Ems. But King William refused the demand and then sent a telegram to Bismarck, informing him of what had occurred, and at the same time giving him permission to make such use of the message as he saw fit. Bismarck unscrupulously edited the telegram in such a way as to convey the impression that the French ambassador had been brusquely dismissed by King William, and then gave it out for publication. War was now inevitable.[6]

713. The Proclamation of the New German Empire (1871). — The astonishing successes of the German armies on French soil (sec. 654) had one far-reaching result upon the German people as a whole. All the obstacles which had hitherto prevented anything more than a partial union of the members of the Germanic body were now swept out of the way by an irresistible tide of national sentiment.

While the siege of Paris was progressing, commissioners were sent by the southern states to Versailles, the headquarters of King William, to represent to him that they were ready and anxious to enter the North German Union. Thus in rapid succession Baden, Hesse, Würtemberg, and Bavaria were received into the Confederation, the name of which was now changed to that of the German Confederation.

[6] Bismarck had made public Napoleon's request for Hesse and Rhenish Bavaria at the time of the Austro-Prussian War. These revelations had created a tremendous sentiment against France not only in the South German states but throughout all Germany.

Scarcely was this accomplished when, upon the suggestion of the king of Bavaria, — who had been coached by Bismarck, — King William, who now bore the title of *President* of the Confederation, was given the title of *German Emperor*, which honor was to be hereditary in his family. On the 18th of January, 1871, within the Palace of Versailles, — the siege of Paris being still in

FIG. 106. — AN INCIDENT OF THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR

General Lapasset, seeing that capture was inevitable, burned the flags in his command to prevent them from falling into the hands of the Germans

progress, — amidst indescribable enthusiasm the Imperial dignity was formally conferred upon King William, and Germany became a federal Empire.

The Empire received a constitution. Though seemingly liberal, its articles were so adroitly drawn as to conceal the real absolutism of the government created. It provided for a parliament or legislature comprising two bodies, a Federal Council (*Bundesrat*) and an Imperial Diet (*Reichstag*). The Federal Council, which formed the upper chamber of the legislature, was composed of sixty-one members, who were appointed by the princes of the federated states. Of the whole number of delegates the Emperor, as king of Prussia, appointed seventeen. The members of the Council voted as instructed by the governments or rulers whom they represented.

The Imperial Diet, which forms the lower chamber of the legislature, comprises about four hundred members elected by practically universal manhood suffrage. The original apportionment was one member for every twenty thousand of the population of the federated states.

We have here the forms of a constitutional parliamentary government. These forms, however, as we have said, merely mask the practically absolute powers of the Emperor. As the one who appoints and controls the vote of the seventeen Prussian members of the Federal Council (in addition to these he also controls the vote of the three delegates representing the imperial province of Alsace-Lorraine), he dominates that body. On all really vital matters it merely registers his will.

As to the apparent powers of the Diet, there are provisions of the constitution which render these wholly illusory and leave to this body nothing more than the semblance of authority. It has, it is true, the right to originate bills, though as a matter of fact most bills, and particularly the important ones, are framed by the Federal Council; but this right signifies very little, since the Federal Council may veto any measure, and this veto can be overcome in no possible constitutional way.

Then, again, the Diet can be dissolved at any time by the Federal Council, which means virtually by the Emperor. Whenever it refuses to act in accord with the imperial will, its members are sent home and a new election ordered, and by this means a new and usually more tractable body is secured.

Furthermore, the Diet has no part in shaping the policies of the government or any control over the administration of affairs. The Imperial Chancellor, who corresponds in his position in the government to the British Premier, is responsible not to the Diet but to the Emperor, who appoints and dismisses him at will. He can disregard with impunity and treat with contempt a vote of lack of confidence by that body, so long as his master, the Emperor, supports him.

Finally, the Diet has practically no control over matters of war and peace. The Emperor can declare a *defensive* war without the

EUROPE
in 1914
0 100 200 300 400 500
Scale of Miles.
30 20 10 0 10
60
50
40
ARCTIC
Arctic Circle
ICELAND
(To Denmark)
Reikjavik
Mt. Hecla
Faroe Is.
(To Denmark)
Shetland Is.
Hebrides
Orkney Is.
SCOTLAND
Glasgow
Belfast
BRITISH
IRELAND
Dublin
Cork
Irish Sea
ATLANTIC
OCEAN
English Channel
ISLES
WALES
ENGLAND
Manchester
Liverpool
Birmingham
London
North
Sea
NETHERLANDS
(Holland)
Haarlem
Amsterdam
Leyden
Utrecht
Rotterdam
Antwerp
BELGIUM
Brussels
Ghent
Bruges
Dover
Calais
Cherbourg
Havre
Seine R.
Paris
Loire R.
FRANCE
Bay of Biscay
Cape Finisterre
Bordeaux
Oporto
Douro R.
CANTABRIAN MTS.
PYRENEES
SPAIN
Madrid
Lisbon
PORTUGAL
Tagus R.
Valencia
Guadalquivir R.
C. St. Vincent
Strait of Gibraltar
Malaga
Gibraltar
(Brit.)
Barcelona
Balearic
Islands
Corsica
Sardinia
Marseille
Rhone R.
Geneva
Lyon
Zurich
SWITZERLAND
Berne
MT. BLANC
Alps
Milan
Venice
Genoa
Po R.
Rome
Naples
MT. VESUVIUS
Palermo
Sicily
Strait of Messi
MT. ETNA
Malta
(To Gr. Britain)
Algiers
Tunis
Fez
Morocco
AFRICA
Mediterranean
Trondhjem
Bergen
Christiania
Skager Rack
Christiansand
Gothenburg
DENMARK
Copenhagen
Hamburg
Elbe R.
Berlin
Cologne
Frankfort
Leipzig
Dresden
Prague
Danube R.
Munich
Vienna
AUSTRIA-H
Trieste
Adriatic Sea
Belgr
Cet
Dnraz
Lofoden
Islands
Ems R.
Weser R.
Oder R.
EM
Triple
Alliance
GERMA
Triple
Entente
ITALY
Apennines
Longitude West from Greenwich 0 Longitude East from Greenwich 10

20
30
40
50
60
70
80
North Cape
OCEAN
Tundras
Lapland
Arctic Circle
Pechora R.
URAL MOUNTAINS
Ob R.
ASIA
White Sea
Archangel
Tobolsk
Gulf of Bothnia
Finland
Dwina R.
Lake Onega
Lake Ladoga
Perm
Gulf of Finland
St. Petersburg
Stockholm
Sea
VALDAI HILLS
Kazan
Kama R.
Riga
Nijni Novgorod
Volga R.
Moscow
Dvina R.
RUSSIA
Orenburg
Saratov
Ural R.
Warsaw
Poland
Kiev
Dniester R.
Dnieper R.
Volga R.
Aral Sea
Carpathian Mts.
Pruth R.
Don R.
Astrakhan
Budapest
HUNGARY
Sea of Azov
Odessa
Crimea
CAUCASUS MTS.
Caspian Sea
Danube R.
ROUMANIA
Bucharest
Sevastopol
Black Sea
MT. ELBRUZ
Baku
Sofia
BALKAN MTS.
Tiflis
Trans-Caucasia
Philippopolis
BULGARIA
Adrianople
Bosporus
TURKEY
Trebizond
Constantinople
Erzeroum
MT. ARARAT
Saloniki
TURKEY IN ASIA
Dardanelles
Comparative Area.
Athens
Smyrna
Aegean Sea
OHIO
Crete
Cyprus
(To Gr. Britain)
41,060 Square Miles.

advice or consent of this body, and since the Imperial Government does not scruple to falsify the truth and proclaim a purely offensive war as a defensive one, the Diet is without power or authority in this important domain.[7]

These various provisions of the constitution leave to the Diet merely the shadow of power and authority, and make it, what it has been called, little more than an official debating club. Thus the constitution given the Empire by Bismarck, instead of creating a truly representative parliamentary government, created (or rather perpetuated) "an autocratic system of government adorned with a democratic façade."

714. The Cession to Germany of Alsace and Lorraine. — The essential provisions of the treaty between France and Germany have already been given (sec. 654). The cession to Germany of Alsace and Lorraine is the only matter connected with these momentous transactions upon which space will allow us here to comment anew.

In insisting upon the surrender of these provinces, which were and which still remain passionately French in sympathy and sentiment, although only partly French in blood, Bismarck has been severely censured, since this was a gross violation of the modern principle of nationality, the inhabitants of the ceded territories being allowed no voice in the question of their transference.

715. Later Events. — For nearly twenty years after the close of the Franco-Prussian War the policy of the new Empire was directed by Bismarck as the first Imperial Chancellor. We can here indicate only two or three of the most noteworthy matters belonging to this period of the great Chancellor's rule.

Special interest attaches to the so-called *Kulturkampf*, which was a long, bitter struggle carried on by Bismarck with the Roman see. The papal party was hostile to the new German Empire because it gave predominance in Germany to Protestant Prussia. Very soon there was open conflict between the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities. Bismarck secured the passage of

[7] Thus the war of 1914, though it was a war of criminal aggression on the part of Germany, was proclaimed by the Emperor as a war in defense of the Fatherland, and was started by him and his military advisers, the Reichstag not being officially informed of the beginning of hostilities till four days later.

laws, both by the Imperial and the Prussian Parliament, in restraint of the power of the Catholic clergy. The Pope declared the laws null and void. The fight grew in bitterness and recalled to mind the struggle between Pope Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV. Bismarck declared, "We shall not go to Canossa." But he did go, at least part way, for in order to secure Catholic support for certain of his policies, he entered into a compromise with the Papacy, and the strife between State and Church was finally stilled (1887).

In his foreign policy Bismarck's greatest achievement was the formation of what is known as the Triple Alliance (*Dreibund*) between the German Empire, Austria-Hungary, and Italy (1882). The chief objects of the Triple Alliance were to curb Russia's ambition in the Balkans and to prevent a war between France and Germany.

In 1888 Emperor William I died at the venerable age of ninety-one. He was followed by his son Frederick, who at the time of his accession was suffering from a fatal malady. He died after a short reign of three months, and his son came to the throne as Emperor William II (1888).

It was generally thought that the young sovereign would be completely under the influence of Bismarck. But soon the Emperor disclosed a very imperious will of his own. His relations with Bismarck became strained, and the aged Chancellor was brusquely dismissed (March 18, 1890). Many felt that the youthful Emperor had treated the creator of the Empire and the maker of the imperial fortunes of the House of Hohenzollern with gross ingratitude. On the other hand, the friends of the Emperor likened Bismarck to Wallenstein, and accused him of "aiming at something like sovereign sway in a province appertaining to the Emperor." [8]

[8] In his retirement at Friedrichsruh, an estate which was a gift to him from the grateful Emperor William I, Bismarck played the part of a "German Prometheus." He hurled defiance at all his enemies and did not scruple to subject the policies of the Emperor and his ministers to the most caustic criticism. The ex-Chancellor died in 1898, being then in his eighty-fourth year.

The reign of William II after the dismissal of Bismarck was a very personal one. He would have made an ideal divine-right king in those halcyon days for autocratic rulers when there were no representative assemblies.

The remarkable growth, in spite of the opposition of the Emperor, of the party known as the Social Democrats, who advocate an extreme programme of social and industrial reform, is one of the most noteworthy facts connected with the domestic history of the Empire.[9]

Selections from the Sources. — *Translations and Reprints*, vol. i, No. 3, for "The Act of Confederation" and other documents (ed. by James Harvey Robinson). *Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman* (being Reflections and Reminiscences of Otto Prince von Bismarck, written and dictated by himself after his retirement from office; ed. by A. J. Butler). MOLTKE, *The Franco-German War, 1870–1871* (trans. by A. Forbes).

Secondary Works. — SYBEL, *The Founding of the German Empire.* ANDREWS, *The Historical Development of Modern Europe*, vol. i, chaps. vi, ix, and x; and vol. ii, chaps. v and vi. HENDERSON, *A Short History of Germany*, vol. ii, chaps. viii–x. LOWE, *Prince Bismarck.* HEADLAM, *Bismarck and the Founding of the German Empire.* LOWE, *The German Emperor William II.* BUSCH, *Our Chancellor.* LOWELL, *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe*, vol. i, chaps. v and vi; and vol. ii, chap. vii.

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. The Carlsbad Decrees. 2. Louis Kossuth and the Hungarian Revolt (1848). 3. Prince Bismarck as "Parliament tamer." 4. Prince Leopold and the Spanish crown. 5. The *Kulturkampf.* 6. The Triple Alliance.

[9] In 1871 this party cast a vote of about 124,000; in 1912 its vote reached the surprising figure of over 4,250,000, more than a third of the total vote cast.

CHAPTER XLI

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY AFTER 1866

716. The Reorganization of the Austrian Empire after Sadowa; the Compromise between Austria and Hungary. — The disaster of Sadowa did for Austria what the disaster of Jena did for Prussia, — it brought about its political and social regeneration.

Chastened by the bitter humiliation and realizing that the maintenance of the old traditional system of absolute government was henceforth impossible, the Emperor Francis Joseph was now ready to make concessions to the national aspirations of the Magyars, and to yield to the growing demands of his subjects for liberal reforms and constitutional government. Soon after Sadowa he called to his aid the able Saxon statesman Count Beust and gave into his hands the task of reorganizing the shattered empire, just as after Jena King Frederick William of Prussia intrusted to Baron vom Stein the readjustment of Prussian affairs (sec. 640).

The first step and the most important one in the process of reorganization was the recognition by the Austrian court of the claims of the Magyars to the right of equality in the monarchy with the hitherto dominant German race. By an agreement known as the *Ausgleich*, or Compromise, the relations of Austria and Hungary in the reconstituted state were defined and regulated. It provided for the division of the old empire into two parts, now designated as the Austrian Empire and the Hungarian Kingdom.[1] Each state was to have its own parliament, the one sitting at Vienna and the other at Budapest, and each was to have complete control of its own internal affairs. Neither was to have the least precedence over the other.

The common interests of the two states, — those embracing foreign affairs, the army, and finances, — were to be regulated by a

[1] The official designation of the dual state was the *Austro-Hungarian Monarchy*.

third peculiar parliament, the so-called "Delegations," composed of sixty delegates from each of the other two parliaments. The hereditary head of the Austrian state was to be also the constitutional king of Hungary.

This celebrated compact was duly ratified by the parliaments of Hungary and Austria, and the long struggle between the Magyars and the House of Hapsburg was at an end. The Hungarian constitution was restored and the same year (1867) the western half of the monarchy was also given a liberal constitution, and Austria-Hungary now definitely entered the ranks of constitutional states.



FIG. 107. — THE PARLIAMENT BUILDING AT BUDAPEST
(From a photograph by the author)

717. The Dependent Races in the Monarchy; Federalism versus Dualism. — The Compromise of 1867 thus reconstructed the old Austrian Empire as a dual monarchy, with the Germans as the ruling race in the western half of the state, and with the Magyars as the ruling race in the eastern half. It made no recognition whatsoever of the historic rights and liberties of the other races or nationalities of the monarchy, of which there were many. That is hardly a figure of speech which described the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy as a "European Tower of Babel." In the Austrian Parliament the oath was administered to the members in eight different languages.

In the eastern half of the monarchy the Magyars, who formed only a minority of the population of the Hungarian kingdom,

but who, like the English, are a people of extraordinary energy and of great pride of race, were holding practically all the non-Magyar races[2] of the kingdom in just such political serfdom as they themselves were subjected to before their emancipation by the events of 1866–1867.

It was the same in the other half of the monarchy. There a German minority[3] held the Czechs in Bohemia and the Poles in Galicia in a state of subjection similar to that in which the Magyars held the non-Magyar races of Hungary. These dependent nationalities claimed that they had as good a right to self-government as had either the Germans or the Magyars.

It was long evident that these contentions would end either in the disruption of the monarchy, or in the recognition by the two dominant races of the justice of the claims of these dependent peoples, and the conversion of the dual monarchy into a federal union composed of as many states as there were different nations or well-defined ethnic groups composing the population of the monarchy. During the life of the Emperor Francis Joseph the popularity of the sovereign with all the various races that composed his people was the only bond of union between them, but this insured the integrity of the monarchy. His popularity did not descend to his successor, Charles VIII, and the reverses suffered by Austria-Hungary in the war of 1914 brought about the disruption of the monarchy in 1918.

718. The International Phase of Austro-Hungarian Questions. — The affairs of Austria-Hungary were almost as much a matter of European concern as were those of the Ottoman Empire. This is so for the reason that most of the ethnic groups within the monarchy, with the exception of the Magyars, who constitute a compact and complete nation, were merely detached areas of larger bodies of kindred peoples in adjoining lands, and that there was a tendency in these small groups to gravitate towards the larger

[2] The census of 1910 gives the total number of inhabitants of Hungary as 20,886,487, of whom only 10,050,575 are returned as being of Hungarian race.

[3] The total population of Austria according to the census of 1910 was 28,571,934; the number of Germans (on basis of language), 9,950,266.

Distribution of Races in
AUSTRIA-HUNGARY
0 50 100 150
Scale of Miles.
REFERENCE
Germans
Czechs
Slovaks
Ruthenians
Poles
Magyars
Serbo Croats
Slovenes
Roumanians
Italians and Ladins
GERMANY
RUSSIA
SAXONY
BOHEMIA
Prague
Pilsen
R. Elbe
R. Moldau
SILESIA
Troppau
Cracow
Lemberg
GALICIA
R. Vistula
R. Dniester
MORAVIA
Brünn
R. March
CARPATHIANS
R. Pruth
BUKOWINA
BAVARIA
R. Inn
R. Danube
Vienna
Kremnitz
AUSTRIA
Salzburg
SALZBURG ALPS
Innsbruck
TYROL
STYRIA
R. Raab
Buda-Pest
HUNGARY
R. Theiss
R. Rhine
ALPS
Klausenburg
TRANSYLVANIA
Trent
Laibach
CARNIOLA
Trieste
R. Drave
R. Maros
Kronstadt
TRANSYLVANIAN ALPS
VENETIA
Istria
Venice
CROATIA
Karlstadt
SLAVONIA
R. Save
Fiume
R. Po
ROUMANIA
ADRIATIC SEA
Ravenna
Florence
BOSNIA
Belgrade
SERVIA
Danube
Zara
DALMATIA
ITALY
Spalato
HERZEGOVINA
Tiber
MONTE NEGRO
Ragusa
Cattaro
THE M.-N. WORKS, BUFFALO
Vienna
Buda-Pest
HUNGARY
BOSNIA
SERVIA
ROUMANIA
Adriatic Sea
AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN DUAL MONARCHY

masses of their kindred in these neighboring countries. Thus the Austrian Germans were drawn towards the German Empire; the Italians in Trieste and the Tyrol towards the Italian kingdom; the Rumanians of Transylvania towards the principality of Rumania; the Slavs of the South towards the Balkan Slav states, and the Slavs of the North, in times of special discontent, towards Russia. It is true, also, that these neighboring states have felt a reciprocal interest in the Austro-Hungarian lands of kindred race, and all have been deeply interested in anything that concerned the stability or lack of stability of the polyglot monarchy.

Selections from the Sources. — BEUST (COUNT VON), *Memoirs.* Count Beust was not only the reorganizer of the Austrian Empire, but the inspirer of many of those liberal reforms which after 1867 gave a new and modern aspect to the political, social, and intellectual life of Austria. His *Memoirs* possess a deep interest for the student of the history of the transition from the Austria of Metternich to the Austria of to-day.

Secondary Works. — LEGER, *A History of Austro-Hungary*, chaps. xxxv–xxxviii. LOWELL, *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe*, vol. ii, chaps. viii–x. ANDREWS, *The Historical Development of Modern Europe*, vol. ii, chaps. vii and xii.

Topics for Class Reports. — At this point it would be well for the teacher to assign as subjects for special study the minor European states, any account of which the limitations of space have excluded from the text. In such assignments the following states should find a place: 1. Greece. 2. The Balkan States. 3. Switzerland. 4. The Scandinavian countries. 5. Belgium. 6. The United Netherlands.

CHAPTER XLII

RUSSIA SINCE THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

719. The Tsar Alexander I as a Liberal and as a Reactionist. — During the earlier years of his reign the Tsar Alexander I (1801–1825) was a zealous advocate of certain liberal ideas. It was due largely to his influence that the French secured a constitution upon the restoration of the Bourbons. He introduced many beneficent reforms into Russia, and even encouraged his subjects to hope that they should have a constitution which would give them part in the government.

But conspiracies among his own subjects and the popular uprisings throughout Europe all tended to create in the Tsar a revulsion of feeling. From an ardent apostle of liberal ideas he was transformed into a violent absolutist, and spent all his latter years in aiding the despotic rulers of Spain, Italy, and Germany to repress every movement among their subjects for political freedom.

720. The Russo-Turkish War of 1828–1829. — Alexander was succeeded by his brother Nicholas I (1825–1855), who, carrying out the later policy of his predecessor, strove to shut out from his empire every liberalizing influence of Western Europe.

In 1828, taking advantage of the embarrassment of the Sultan through a stubborn insurrection in Greece,[1] Nicholas declared war against the Ottoman Porte. The Russian troops crossed the

[1] This was the struggle known as the War of Greek Independence (1821–1829). This war was a phase of the liberal and national movement which in the revolutionary year of 1821 agitated the Italian and Iberian peninsulas. Lord Byron devoted his life and fortune to the cause of Greek freedom. He died of fever at the siege of Missolonghi (1824). England, France, and Russia finally intervened. The Turko-Egyptian fleet was destroyed by the fleets of the allies in the bay of Navarino (1827). The year after this event began the Russian campaign in the Danubian provinces, as narrated in the text.

Balkans without serious opposition, and were marching upon Constantinople when the Sultan sued for peace. The Treaty of Adrianople brought the war to a close (1829).

Tsar Nicholas restored his conquests in Europe, but held some provinces in Asia which gave him control of the eastern shore of the Euxine. The Turkish provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia were rendered virtually independent of the Sultan. All Greece south of Thessaly and Epirus was liberated, and along with most of the islands of the Ægean was formed into an independent kingdom under the joint guardianship of England, France, and Russia. Prince Otto of Bavaria accepted the crown, and became the first king of the little Hellenic state [2] (1832).

721. The Polish Revolt (1830–1832). — In accordance with a mandate of the Congress of Vienna Poland was reëstablished as a constitutional kingdom dependent upon Russia in some such way as Ireland was subject to England previous to the Union in 1801. But the rule of the Tsar over the Poles was tyrannical, and they were impatient of an opportunity to throw off the Russian yoke. The revolutionary movements of the year 1830 sent a wave of hope through Poland; the people arose and drove out the Russian garrisons. The armies of the Tsar, however, were quickly on the spot, and before the close of the year 1831 the Polish patriots were once more under the foot of their Russian master.

It was a hard fate that awaited the unhappy nation. Their constitution was taken away and Poland was made a mere province of the Russian Empire (1832). Multitudes were banished to Siberia, while thousands more sought an asylum in England,

[2] In 1864 the little kingdom was enlarged through the cession to it of the Ionian Islands by England, in whose hands they had been since the Congress of Vienna. In 1881 it received Thessaly and a part of Epirus by cession from Turkey, but in 1897, as the result of an unfortunate war with the Sultan, was forced to accede to a treaty which gave back to the Ottoman Porte a strip of Northern Thessaly. Under the régime of freedom substantial progress took the place of stagnation and decay. Industry and commerce revived. The Isthmus of Corinth was pierced by a ship canal, which was opened for traffic in 1893. Railroads were built; Athens took on the appearance of a modern capital. At the time of the outbreak of the war of 1914 its two universities had an attendance of more than three thousand students — a good omen for the future.

America, and other countries. Of all the peoples that rose for freedom in 1830, none suffered so cruel and complete an extinguishment of their hopes as did the patriot Poles.[8]

722. **The Crimean War** (1853–1856). — A celebrated parable employed by the Tsar Nicholas in conversation with the English minister at St. Petersburg throws a good deal of light upon the circumstances that led to the Crimean War. "We have on our hands," said the Tsar, "a sick man — a very sick man; it would be a great misfortune if he should give us the slip some of these days, especially if it happened before all the necessary arrangements were made."

Nicholas had cultivated friendly relations with the English government, and he now proposed that England and Russia should divide the estate of the "sick man," by which phrase Turkey of course was meant. England was to be allowed to take Egypt and Crete, while the Turkish provinces in Europe were to be taken under the protection of the Tsar, which meant of course the complete absorption, in due time, of all Southeastern Europe into the Russian Empire.

A pretense for hastening the dissolution of the sick man was not long wanting. A quarrel between the Greek and Latin Christians at Jerusalem about the holy places was made the ground by Nicholas for demanding of the Sultan the admission and recognition of a Russian protectorate over all Greek Christians in the Ottoman dominions. The demand was rejected, and Nicholas prepared for war. The Sultan appealed to the Western powers for help. England and France responded to the appeal, and later Sardinia joined her forces to theirs (sec. 692).

England fought to prevent Russia from getting through the Bosporus to the Mediterranean and thus endangering her route to her Eastern possessions. The French Emperor acted under a variety of motives, — a friendly feeling towards England, a desire to avenge Moscow, and a wish to render his recently established imperial throne attractive to the French people by surrounding it with the glamour of successful war.

[8] For Russia's part in the affairs of the revolutionary years 1848–49, see sec. 706, n. 2.

The main interest of the struggle centered about Sevastopol, in the Crimea, Russia's great naval and military depot in the Euxine. The siege of this place, which lasted eleven months, was one of the most memorable in history. The Russian general Todleben earned a great fame through his masterly defense of the works. The English "Light Brigade" earned immortality in its memorable charge at Balaklava. The French troops, through their dashing bravery, brought great fame to the Emperor who had sent them to gather glory for his throne.

The Russians were at length forced to evacuate their stronghold. The war was now soon brought to an end by the Treaty of Paris (March 30, 1856). The keynote of this treaty was the maintenance in its integrity of the Ottoman Empire as a barrier against Muscovite encroachments. Russia was given back Sevastopol, but was required to surrender some territory at the mouth of the Danube; to abandon all claims to a protectorate over any of the subjects of the Porte; and to agree not to raise any more fortresses on the Euxine nor keep upon that sea any armed ships, save what might be needed for police service.[4]

723. Emancipation of the Russian Serfs (1861). — The name of Tsar Alexander II (1855–1881) will live in history as the Emancipator of the forty-six millions of Russian serfs. In order to render intelligible what emancipation meant for the serfs, a word is needed respecting the former land system in Russia and the personal status of the serf.

As to the first, the estate of the lord was divided into two parts, the smaller of which was reserved by the proprietor for his own use, the larger being allotted to his serfs, who formed a village community known as the *Mir*.[5]

[4] Russia repudiated this article of the treaty during the Franco-Prussian War in 1871. She then restored the fortresses of Sevastopol, and before the opening of the war of 1914 was maintaining a strong fleet of war ships on the Black Sea.

[5] This social and economic group affords the key to much of the history of the Russian people. It is the Russian counterpart of the village of serfs on the mediæval manor of Western Europe. It is a cluster of a dozen or perhaps a hundred families, —a clan settled down to agricultural life. At the time of Peter the Great ninety-nine out of every hundred Russians were members of *Mirs*. To-day the ancient Mir has practically disappeared from Russia.

Besides working the village lands, the fruits of which were enjoyed by the serfs, the villagers were obliged to till the lands of the lord, three days in a week being the usual service required. The serfs were personally subject to the lord to the extent that he might flog them in case of disobedience, but he could not sell them individually as slaves are sold; yet when he sold his estate the whole community of serfs passed with it to the new proprietor.

The Emancipation Code, "the Magna Carta of the Russian peasant," which was promulgated in 1861, required the masters of the peasant serfs to give them the lands they had farmed for themselves, for which, however, they were to make some fixed return in labor or rent.[6] The lands thus acquired became the common property of the village. All other serfs, such as house servants and operatives in factories, were to gain their freedom at the end of two years' additional service, during which time, however, they were to receive fair wages.

As in the case of the emancipation of the slaves in our Southern States, the emancipation of the Russian serfs has not met all the hopeful expectations of the friends of the reform. One cause of the unsatisfactory outcome of the measure is that the villagers did not get enough land, save in those districts where the earth is very rich, to enable them to support themselves by its tillage. Hence many of them have fallen into debt and become the victims of heartless usurers.

724. The Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878; the Treaty of Berlin; the Dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. — Anxiously as the Treaty of Paris had provided for the permanent settlement of the Eastern Question, barely twenty-two years had passed before it was again up before Europe, and Russia and Turkey were again in arms. The Sultan could not or would not give his Christian subjects that protection which he had solemnly promised should be given. In 1875 the Greek Christian population of

[6] The serfs on the crown lands, about 23,000,000 in number, had already been freed by special edicts (the first issued in July, 1858). They were given at once, without any return being exacted, the lands they had so long tilled as nominal bondsmen. We say *nominal* bondsmen, since this class labored under only a few restrictions and were subject to the payment merely of a light rent.

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE 1914
0 100 200 300 400
Scale of Miles.
Russian
Austrian
Greek
Rumanian
Bulgarian
Ottoman
English
AUSTRIA-HUNGARY
RUSSIA
BOHEMIA
MORAVIA
GALICIA AND LODOMERIA
TRANSYLVANIA
BESS-ARABIA
BOSNIA
SERVIA
MONTE-NEGRO
ALBANIA
BULGARIA
RUMANIA
GREECE
TURKEY
ARMENIA
TURKEY IN ASIA
PERSIA
EMPIRE
ARABIA
BLACK SEA
Sea of Azov
CASPIAN SEA
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
ADRIATIC SEA
AEGEAN SEA
IONIAN ISLANDS
CRIMEA
CRETE
CYPRUS
SICILY
MALTA
Vienna
Prague
Budapest
Constantinople
Rome
Odessa
Kherson
Sebastopol
Kaffa
Kertch
Akerman
Kiev
Belgrade
Bucharest
Sofia
Adrianople
Smyrna
Angora
Trebizond
Erzerum
Batum
Tiflis
Ardahan
Kars
Erivan
Mosul
Bagdad
Damascus
Beirut
Aleppo
Tripoli
Nikosia
Famagusta
Rhodes
Candia
Salonica
Monastir
Durazzo
Trieste
Venice
Naples
Palermo
Messina
Catania
Malta
Tarento
Brusa
Konieh
Adalia
Tarsus
Adana
Antioch
Harput
Diarbekr
Urfa
Kalsarlyeh
Amasia
Tokat
Sinope
Samsun
Skutari
Gallipoli
Janina
Larissa
Trikala
Lamia
Patras
Corinth
Athens
Sparta
Navarino
Corone
Kanea
Scutari
Plevna
Shumla
Varna
Burgas
Widin
Sillistria
Jassy
Odessa
Presburg
Innsbruck
Agram
Semlin
Hermanstadt
Ragusa
Cattaro
Spizza
Zara
Spalato
Ravenna
San Marino
Gaeta
Benevento
Pisa
Rivers
Danube
Save
Drave
Theiss
Maros
Pruth
Dniester
Bug
Dnieper
Don
Kuban
Euphrates
Tigris
Aras
L. Van
Ararat

Herzegovina and Bosnia, European provinces of the Ottoman Empire, goaded to desperation by the oppression of Turkish tax-gatherers, rose in revolt. Then the Bulgarians also rose. The Turkish measures of repression resulted in what are known as the "Bulgarian atrocities," — massacres of Christian men, women, and children more revolting perhaps than any others of which history had told.

Fierce indignation was kindled throughout Europe. Servia and Montenegro declared war. The Russian armies were set in motion. Kars in Asia Minor and Plevna in European Turkey, the latter after a memorable siege, fell into the hands of the Russians, and the armies of the Tsar were once more in full march upon Constantinople, with the prospect of soon ending forever Turkish rule on European soil, when England, to retain the balance of power in Europe, intervened, sent her fleet through the Dardanelles, and arrested the triumphant march of the Russians.

The Treaty of Berlin[7] (1878) adjusted once more the disorganized affairs of the Sublime Porte and bolstered up as well as

[7] In this treaty the great powers revised the Treaty of San Stefano which Russia had concluded with Turkey, and which practically expelled the Ottoman Porte from Europe. "[It is] 'an essential principle of the law of nations that no Power can repudiate treaty engagements or modify treaty provisions, except with the consent of the contracting parties by mutual agreement.' . . . It was in virtue of this principle that Russia was obliged to submit the Russo-Turkish Treaty of San Stefano, and with it the fruits of her victories . . ., to the arbitrament of the Congress of Berlin. At that Congress Bismarck played his favorite rôle of 'honest broker,' and there is considerable ground for believing that he sold the same stock several times over to different clients and pocketed the 'differences.' What kind of conflicting assurances he gave to the different Powers will never be fully known, but there is good ground for believing that in securing the temporary occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina he had in mind the ultimate Germanization of the Adriatic, and that domination of the Mediterranean at the expense of England which has long been the dream of German publicists from Treitschke onward. What, however, clearly emerged from the Congress, and was embodied in Article XXV of the Berlin Treaty, was, that Austria was to occupy and administer Bosnia-Herzegovina under a European mandate. She acquired lordship without ownership; in other words, the territory became a Protectorate. Her title, as it originated in, so it was limited by, the Treaty of Berlin. Exactly thirty years later, in the autumn of 1908, Austria, acting in concert with Germany, abused her fiduciary position and without any mandate from the Powers annexed the territory of which she had been made the guardian. This arbitrary action was a violation of the principle to which she and Germany had subscribed at the London Conference, and Sir Edward Grey [at the time of this

was possible the "sick man." But he lost a good part of his estate, for even his friends had no longer any hope either of his recovery or of his reformation. Out of those provinces of his dominions in Europe in which the Christian population was most numerous, there was created a group of wholly independent or half-independent states.[8] The northern frontier of the Ottoman Empire in Europe was thus pushed back to the Balkans. Bosnia and Herzegovina were given to Austria-Hungary to administer, but were not actually severed from the Ottoman Empire until they were annexed by Austria in 1908.

The island of Cyprus, by a secret arrangement between the Ottoman Porte and the English government, was ceded to England "to be occupied and administered." In return England guaranteed the integrity of the Sultan's possessions in Asia.

Russia acquired some places in Armenia, which gave her fuller control of the eastern shores of the Euxine, and also received Bessarabia on the Lower Danube, which territory she had been forced to give up at the close of the Crimean War. In a word, Russia regained everything she had lost in that struggle, while Turkey was shorn of half her European possessions. There were left in Europe under the direct authority of the Sultan barely five million subjects, about one half of these being Christians.[9]

action] attempted, as Lord Granville had done before him, to preserve the credit of the public law of Europe by a conference which should consider the compensation due to Servia for an act which so gravely compromised her security." — *The War Book of the German Staff* (Introduction by J. H. Morgan), p. 23.

[8] The absolute independence of Rumania (the ancient provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia), Servia, and Montenegro was formally acknowledged; Bulgaria, north of the Balkans, was to enjoy self-government, but was to pay tribute to the Porte; Eastern Rumelia was to have a Christian governor, but was to remain under the dominion of the Sultan. In 1885 Eastern Rumelia united with Bulgaria.

[9] The career of the little states carved out of the lands liberated from the Ottoman yoke has been most turbulent. But this is not strange, since the long subjection of these regions to the barbarous rule of the Turk has prevented their sharing in the general progress of Europe and has left their peoples in the mediæval stage of civilization, — a fact startlingly emphasized by the assassination in 1903 of the king and queen of Servia, the account of which crime reads like a displaced chapter from the history of the Middle Ages. The situation of things here in the Balkans contributed largely to the bringing on of the World War (see Supplemental Chapter, secs. 771, 773, 775).

725. The Liberal Movement in Russia; Nihilism and Terrorism. — We must now note a movement in Russian society more significant for Russian history and thus for general history than any of the wars of the Tsars or the diplomacy of the Muscovite court. This is the intellectual revolt of the educated Russian classes against the autocratic and repressive government of the Tsar.

This Liberal movement is nothing else than the outworking in Russia of the ideas of the French Revolution. "In regard to the future consequences of this singular revolution," writes that keen observer, Arthur Young, "as an example to other nations, there can be no doubt but the spirit which has produced it will, sooner or later, spread throughout Europe, according to the different degrees of enlightenment amongst the common people." Without doubt the deepest cause of the Liberal movement which has agitated Russia for more than a century must be sought in the awakening intelligence of the Russian nation.

But if some definite beginning of the movement be sought, this may be found in the events of 1813–1815. In those years, as it has been put, the whole Russian army, like the great Tsar Peter, went on a pilgrimage to the West, and, like Peter, they got some new ideas. This was simply a repetition of what had occurred in the case of those Frenchmen who in 1776 went to America to take part in the War of American Independence (sec. 560).

Those carrying on this propaganda of Liberalism are known as Nihilists. They are found especially in the faculties and among the students of the universities. Their fundamental demands are for constitutional representative government, the reform of the judicial system, and the removal of the restriction upon free discussion of public matters. In a word, they demand that the Russian people shall enjoy all those rights and immunities which the peoples of Western Europe have secured and are now enjoying.

This revolutionary propaganda was hindered and thwarted by the stolid ignorance of the Russian peasantry, who gave to the Tsar a blind devotion, and regarded his person and his office with a superstitious veneration. In the face of this inertness and blindness of the Russian masses, the leaders of the revolt are helpless, — all

of which affords a fresh illustration of the truth that Revolution is impossible without Renaissance and Reformation. Russia, as regards the common people, has had neither. The true Political Revolution awaits the intellectual revival and the moral reform.

At the time of the Russo-Turkish War of 1878–1879 the Liberal movement assumed a violent phase, — just as the Revolution in France did in 1793, — being then transformed into what is known as Terrorism. Nihilism took this form under the persecutions and repressions of the government. The principle of the extreme Nihilists, or Terrorists, that assassination is a righteous means of political reform was now acted upon. March 13, 1881, the Tsar Alexander was assassinated. After that event the government under Alexander III (1881–1894) was even more repressive than before; and for the first ten years of his reign, Nicholas II (1894–1917) followed the policies of his father.

There could be but one outcome to this contest between the "Autocrat of all the Russias"[10] and his subjects. Either through wise concessions on the part of its rulers, or through the throes of a terrible revolution like that of 1789 in France, the Russian Empire was bound sooner or later to become a free self-governing state. The Tsars of Russia were simply fighting the hopeless battle that has been fought and lost by the despotic sovereigns of every other European country, a battle which has always the same issue, — the triumph of Liberal principles and the admission of the people to a participation in the government.

726. The Russianizing of Finland. — Like all autocrats the Tsars aimed at the establishment of uniformity throughout their empire. Their maxim was, "One faith, one king, one law." The dealings of Tsar Nicholas with Finland will illustrate how all the non-Russian races of the empire were made the victims of the policy of the Tsars to Russianize their

[10] It is only theoretically of course that the Tsar was the autocratic ruler of Russia. The power behind the throne, the actual ruler, was the hierarchy of officials, who constituted what is known as a bureaucracy. This body of narrow-minded, selfish, and corrupt officials has been well likened to the monster in Mrs. Shelley's romance *Frankenstein*. Like that monster it got beyond the control of its creator and committed wanton and revolting crimes.

dominions. Finland was ceded to Russia by Sweden in 1809 and formed a grand duchy of the Russian Empire. It had a liberal constitution which the Tsars swore to maintain and which secured the Finns a full measure of local self-government. Under their constitution the Finns, who number about two million souls, were a loyal, contented, and prosperous people. During his reign the Tsar Nicholas by a series of imperial decrees practically annulled the ancient Finnish constitution and reduced the country to the condition of an administrative district of the empire.

The Duma. — The disastrous results of the Russo-Japanese War (see pages 693–695) imparted a great impetus to the Liberal movement in Russia. Popular discontent increased until, in August, 1905, an emphatic demand was made for a representative assembly. The Tsar was forced to yield, and in October issued a manifesto authorizing the calling of an assembly, or Duma. The first Duma was in session by May 10, 1906, spoke boldly for reform, and attempted some constructive legislation; but its activities were hindered by the Tsar and the Council of the Empire. It was dissolved in July and a second Duma summoned. This second body was in session from March 5 to June 16, 1907, but it too was dissolved after an effort to control its actions by the arbitrary arrest of progressive leaders. In November of this same year a third Duma assembled. Its membership was composed largely of reactionaries elected by the privileged classes; in no sense was it a body representative of the people. It proved to be obedient to the autocratic rule and destroyed what little confidence was left in the promises of the Tsar for reform and constitutional government. The term of the third Duma having expired, a fourth was elected in November, 1912, which proved even more conservative than the third assembly. This body passed out of existence when prorogued by the government in September, 1915.

Secondary Works. — RAMBAUD, *History of Russia*, vol. iii. LEROY-BEAULIEU, *The Empire of the Tsars and the Russians*. KINGLAKE, *The Invasion of the Crimea*. MORFILL, *The Story of Russia*, chaps. x and xi. WALLACE, *Russia*. STEPNIAK, *The Russian Peasantry*. NOBLE, *The Russian Revolt* and *Russia and the Russians*.

CHAPTER XLIII

EUROPEAN EXPANSION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

I. Causes and General Phases of the Expansion Movement

727. Significance of the Expansion of Europe into Greater Europe. — In speaking of the establishment of the European colonies and settlements of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries we likened this expansion of Europe into Greater Europe to the expansion in antiquity of Greece into Greater Greece and Rome into Greater Rome (sec. 310). We have now to say something of the later phases of this wonderful outward movement of the European peoples.

In the first place we should note that it is this expansion movement which gives such significance to that intellectual, moral, and political development of the European peoples which we have been studying. This evolution might well be likened to the religious evolution in ancient Judea. That development of a new religion was a matter of transcendent importance because the new faith was destined not for a little corner of the earth but for all the world. Likewise the creation by Renaissance, Reformation, and Revolution of a new, rich, and progressive civilization in Europe is a matter of vast importance to universal history because that civilization has manifestly been wrought out not for a single continent or for a single race but for all the continents and for all mankind.

We are now to see how the bearers of this new culture have carried or are carrying it to all lands and are communicating it to all peoples, thereby opening up a new era not alone in the history of Europe but in the history of the world.

728. The Fate of the Earlier Colonial Empires; Decline and Revival of Interest in Colonies. — The history we have narrated has revealed the fate of all the colonial empires founded by the various European nations during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The magnificent Portuguese Empire soon became the spoil of the Dutch and the English; France lost her colonial possessions to England; a great part of the colonies of the Dutch also finally fell into English hands; before the end of the eighteenth century England lost through revolution her thirteen colonies in North America; and in the early part of the nineteenth century Spain in like manner lost all her dependencies on the mainland of the New World.[1]

After these discouraging experiences with their colonies the governments of Europe lost interest for a while in possessions beyond the seas. Statesmen came to hold the doctrine that colonies are "like fruit, which as soon as ripe falls from the tree." The English minister Disraeli, in referring to England's colonial possessions, once used these words: "Those wretched colonies are millstones about our neck."

Before the close of the nineteenth century, however, there sprang up a most extraordinary revival of interest in colonies and dependencies, and the leading European states began to compete eagerly for over-the-sea possessions.

729. Causes of the Revived Interest in Colonies. — A variety of causes concurred to awaken or to foster this new interest in colonies. One cause is to be found in the rapid increase during the nineteenth century of the people of European stock. At the beginning of the century the estimated population of Europe (excluding Turkey) was about one hundred and sixty millions; at the end of the century it had risen to four hundred and thirty-six millions. During this same period the number of people of European stock in the world at large rose from about one

[1] For notices of the rise and decline of the Portuguese Empire, see secs. 304, 306, 307 n. 5, 355, and 679 n. 2; of the Dutch, secs. 355, 492, and 736 n. 14; of the French, secs. 424, 452, 540, and 611; of the English, secs. 363, 392, 461, 540, and 541; and of the Spanish, secs. 311–313, 680, and 681.

hundred and seventy millions to over five hundred millions.[2] This increase in numbers of the European peoples is one of the most important facts in modern history. It has caused Europe to overflow and to inundate the world. It has made the smallest of the continents the mother and nursery of nations.[3]

The political significance of this great outward movement, which almost unnoticed for a long time by European statesmen was creating a new Europe outside of Europe and shifting the center of gravity of the world, at last attracted the attention of the European governments and awakened an unwonted interest in colonies and dependencies.

A second cause is to be found in the industrial revolution which began in England towards the end of the eighteenth century (sec. 544) and which gradually transformed the industrial life of all the more advanced nations. The enormous quantity of fabrics and wares of every kind which the new processes of manufacture created, led to sharp competition among commercial classes in the different nations for the control of the markets in the uncivilized or semi-civilized lands. In order to secure a monopoly of these markets for their subjects it was thought necessary by the European governments to take possession of these lands or to establish protectorates over them.

A third cause, one which tended to give a general character to the colonial movement, was the manifest advantage that England was deriving from her colonial possessions, especially as revealed on the occasions of Queen Victoria's Golden and Diamond Jubilees in 1887 and 1897, when there passed along the streets of London imposing processions of representatives of all

[2] These earlier numbers must be regarded as mere approximations. We have no reliable figures for the beginning of the century. Census-taking is practically a nineteenth-century innovation, save in two or three countries.

[3] The great tide of emigration which during the past century has flowed from Europe into the unoccupied places of the world was not set in motion by any single cause. With the pressure arising from the growing population of Europe, which may be regarded as the primary cause of the movement, there concurred a great variety of other causes, political, religious, and economic in their nature, such as have always been inciting or fostering causes in every great migration and colonization movement known to history.

the races of the British Empire. This spectacle, unparalleled in modern times in its suggestions of imperial riches and power, produced a profound impression upon the witnessing nations. It stirred in them a spirit of emulation and made them eager to secure colonial possessions and dependencies that they too like England might rule over many lands and races.

Thus it came about through these and other influences that during the last fifteen or twenty years of the nineteenth century almost all the old colonizing peoples of Europe were exerting themselves to the utmost to build up new empires to take the place of those they had lost, while other nations that had never possessed colonies now also began to compete eagerly with those earlier in the field for over-the-sea possessions.

FIG. 108. — HENRY M. STANLEY. (From a photograph)

730. **Stanley's Discoveries open up the "Dark Continent."** — By the time, however, of this awakening of the governments of Europe to the importance of colonies almost all the lands outside of Europe suited to European settlement were closed against true colonizing enterprises by having been appropriated by England, or through their being in the control of independent states that had grown out of colonies planted by immigrants of European speech and blood. The makers of new empires had no longer the whole world before them from which to choose.

Africa, however, was still left. For a century intrepid explorers had been endeavoring to uncover the mysteries of that continent. Among these was the missionary-explorer David Livingstone. He died in 1873. His mantle fell upon Henry M. Stanley, who a short time after the death of Livingstone set out on an adventurous expedition across Africa[4] (1874–1877), in which journey

[4] Stanley had made an earlier expedition (1871–1872) in search of Livingstone.

he discovered the course of the Congo and learned the nature of its great basin. Not since the age of Columbus had there been any discoveries in the domain of geography comparable in importance to these of Stanley. Stanley gave the world an account of his journey in a book bearing the title *Through the Dark Continent*. The appearance of this work marks an epoch in the history of Africa. It inspired innumerable enterprises, political, commercial, and philanthropic, whose aim was to develop the natural resources of the continent and to open it up to civilization.

731. **The Founding of the Congo Free State** (1885). — One immediate outcome of the writings and discoveries of Stanley was the founding of the Congo Free State.

King Leopold II of Belgium was one of those whose imagination was touched by the vast possibilities of the African continent. He conceived the idea of establishing in the valley of the Congo a great state which should be a radiating center for the diffusion of the benefits of civilization over the Dark Continent. Through his efforts an International African Association was formed, under whose auspices Stanley, after his return from his second expedition, was sent out to establish stations in the Congo basin and to lay there the foundation of European order and government.

The Association had found in Stanley a remarkably able lieutenant. His work as an organizer and administrator was carried on almost continuously for five years (1879–1884), "long years of bitter labor," as he himself speaks of them. He made treaties with over four hundred and fifty native chiefs, who ceded to him their sovereign rights over their lands. He founded numerous stations along the banks of the Congo and its tributaries. By these and like herculean labors Stanley — *Stanley Africanus*, it has been suggested, should be his ennobled name — became the real founder of what is now known as the Congo Free State and earned a place among the great administrators and state builders of modern times.[5]

[5] From 1882, the year of the actual founding of the state, until 1908 the country was merely an appanage of the Belgian crown. In 1908 Leopold II (Belgian king) ceded the state to Belgium. Important products of the country are rubber, palmnuts, and cocoa. Cotton and tobacco are successfully cultivated. Recent estimates

THE PARTITION OF
AFRICA
Showing the Colonies, Dependencies, Protectorates, and Spheres of Influence of the different European States until 1914.
LEGEND
British French German
Portuguese Italian
Regions not under European control are uncolored
Railways Finished Proposed
Scale of Miles
0 500 1000
Longitude 30 20 West from 10 Greenwich 0 10
ATLANTIC OCEAN
Equator
Tropic of Cancer
Strait of Gibraltar
Algeciras
Ceuta (Span.)
Tangiers
Casablanca
Madeira Is. (Port.)
Agadir
Canary Is. (Span.)
Rio de Oro (Span.)
MOROCCO
Morocco
Fez
Oran
Algiers
Constantine
Biskra
ALGERIA
(Annexed to France, 1848)
TUNIS
Tunis
Tripoli
MAURITANIA
Timbuktu
Cape Verde Is. (Port.)
C. Verde
St. Louis
Senegal R.
Dakar
SENEGAL
GAMBIA
Bathurst
Bamaku
UPPER SENEGAL AND NIGER
Niger R.
PORTUGUESE GUINEA
FRENCH GUINEA
Konakry
Freetown
SIERRA LEONE
LIBERIA
Monrovia
Bingerville
IVORY COAST
Kumassi
ASHANTEE
NOR. TER.
GOLD COAST
TOGO
DAHOMEY
Porto Novo
Lagos
Anambu R.
NORTHERN NIGERIA
Asaba
Calabar
Buea
KAMERUN
Fernando Po I. (Spanish)
Princess I. (Port.)
Duala
SPANISH GUINEA
Libreville
St. Thomas I. (Port.)
Annobon I. (Span.)
FRENCH
Brazzaville
Kabinda (Port.)
Boma
LOWER
Loanda
Benguela
Ascension Is. (To Gr. Br.)
St. Helena (To Gr. Br.)
GUINEA
GERMAN
Swakopmund
Walfisch Bay (To Gr. Br.)
Angra Pequena
Cape To
C. of Good

Beirut
Damascus
Jaffa
Jerusalem
Port Said
SUEZ CANAL
Suez
Alexandria
Cairo
EGYPT
(Tributary of Turkey to 1914)
Assouan
1st Cataract
Wadi Halfa
Madina
Mecca
ARABIA
Red Sea
Nile
Port Sudan
Suakin
Bombay
Arabian Sea
Kassala
Massawa
Asmara
ERITREA
Omdurman
Khartum
ANGLO-EGYPTIAN SUDAN
DARFUR
El Obeid
Aden
Sokotra
(To Gr.Br.)
C. Guardafui
FRENCH SOMALI COAST
Jibuti
Berbera
Fashoda
BRITISH SOMALILAND
Adis Ababa
ABYSSINIA
ITALIAN SOMALILAND
Stanleyville
Albert Nyanza
UGANDA
BRITISH EAST AFRICA
Port Florence
Victoria Nyanza
Equator
Mombasa
Seychelles Is.
(To Gr.Br.)
Nyangwe
Lake Tanganyika
GERMAN EAST AFRICA
Zanzibar (British)
Dar-es-Salaam
Amirante Is.
(To Gr.Br.)
INDIAN OCEAN
L. Bangweolo
Lake Nyasa
Comoro Is. (Fr.)
Mayotte
Mozambique
Victoria Falls
Zambesi R.
Salisbury
Beira
Sofala
Tamatave
Tananarivo
MADAGASCAR
(To France)
Rodriguez I.
(To Gr.Br.)
Reunion I. (Fr.)
Mauritius I. (To Gr.Br.)
Bulawayo
BECHUANALAND
Tropic of Capricorn
Pretoria
Johannesburg
Mafeking
Delagoa Bay
Lourenco Marquez
Kimberley
MAJUBA HILL
Pietermaritzburg
Durban
Comparative Area
PENN.
45,215 Square Miles
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
CAPE OF GOOD HOPE
Port Elizabeth
40 Longitude 50 East from 60 Greenwich 70

732. The Partition of Africa. — The discoveries of Stanley and the founding of the Congo Free State were the signal for a scramble among the powers of Europe for African territory. England, France, and Germany were the strongest competitors and they got the largest shares. In the short space of fifteen years Africa became a dependency of Europe. The only native states retaining their independence by the end of the nineteenth century were Abyssinia and Morocco,[6] together with the negro republic of Liberia, the government of which is in the hands of American freedmen or their descendants.

This transference of the control of the affairs of Africa from the hands of its native inhabitants or those of Asiatic Mohammedan intruders to the hands of Europeans is without question the most momentous transaction in the history of that continent, and one which must shape its future destiny.

In the following sections of this chapter, in which we propose briefly to rehearse the part which each of the leading European states has taken in the general expansion movement, we shall necessarily have to speak of the part which each played in the partition of Africa and tell what each secured.

II. The Expansion of England

733. England in America; the Dominion of Canada. — The separation of the thirteen American colonies from England in 1776 (sec. 541) seemed to give a fatal blow to English hopes of establishing a great colonial empire in America. But half of North America still remained in English hands.

of the population of the colony vary from nine millions to fifteen millions. A railroad projected by Stanley, two hundred and fifty miles in length, has been built around the falls of the Congo. This enterprise has brought into touch with civilization a vast region which throughout all the long period of history up to the time of Stanley's achievement had been absolutely cut off from communication with the civilized races of mankind.

[6] France established a protectorate over Morocco in 1912. It was the German Kaiser's unjustified intervention with threat of arms in Moroccan matters that tended greatly to increase that tension between Germany on the one hand and France and Great Britain on the other which was an important factor in the European situation just preceding the catastrophe of 1914 (see Supplemental Chapter XLV, secs. 770, 773).

Gradually the attractions of British North America as a dwelling-place for settlers of European stock became known. Immigration, mostly from the British Isles, increased in volume, so that the growth of the country in population during the nineteenth century was phenomenal, rising from about a quarter of a million at the opening of the period to over five millions at its close.

One of the most important matters in the political history of Canada since the country passed under English rule is the granting of responsible government to the provinces in 1841. Up to that time England's colonial system was in principle like that which had resulted in the loss to the British Empire of the thirteen colonies. The concession marked a new era in the history of English colonization. The Canadian provinces now became in all home matters absolutely self-governing.[7]

The concession of complete self-government to the provinces was followed, in 1867, by the union of Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick in a federal state under the name of the Dominion of Canada.[8] The constitution of the Dominion, save as to the federal principle, is modeled after the British, wherein it differs from the recently framed Australian constitution, which follows closely that of the United States.

The political union of the provinces made possible the successful accomplishment of one of the great engineering undertakings of our age. This was the construction of a transcontinental railroad from Montreal to Vancouver. This road has done for the confirming of the federal union and for the industrial development of the Dominion what the building of similar transcontinental lines has done for the United States.

By reason of its vast geographical extent, — its area is more than thirty-five times as great as that of the British Isles, — its inexhaustible mineral deposits, its unrivaled fisheries, its limitless forests, grazing lands, and wheat fields, its bracing climate, and

[7] The treaty-making power and matters of peace and war are still in the hands of the English government.

[8] Later the confederation was joined by British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, and other provinces. Newfoundland has steadily refused to join the union.

above all its free institutions, the Dominion of Canada seems marked out to be one of the great future homes of the Anglo-Saxon race. What the United States now is, the Dominion seems destined at a time not very remote to become.

734. England in Australasia;[9] the proclamation of the Commonwealth of Australia (1901). — About the time that England lost her American colonies the celebrated navigator Captain Cook reached and explored the shores of New Zealand and Australia (1769–1771). Disregarding the claims of earlier visitors to these lands, he took possession of the islands for the British crown.

The best use to which England could at first think to put the new lands was to make them a place of exile for criminals. The first shipload of convicts was landed at Botany Bay in Australia in 1788. But the agricultural riches of the new lands, their adaptability to stock raising, and the healthfulness of the climate soon drew to them a stream of English immigrants. In 1851 came the announcement of the discovery of fabulously rich deposits of gold, and then set in a tide of immigration such as the world has seldom seen.

Before the close of the century five flourishing colonies (New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and West Australia), with an aggregate population, including that of the neighboring island of Tasmania, of almost four millions, had grown up along the fertile well-watered rim of the Australian continent and had developed free institutions similar to those of the mother country.

The great political event in the history of these colonies was their consolidation, just at the opening of the twentieth century, into the Commonwealth of Australia, a federal union like our own.

The vast possibilities of the future of this new Anglo-Saxon commonwealth in the South Pacific has impressed in an unwonted way the imagination of the world. It is possible that in the

[9] Australasia, meaning "south land of Asia," is the name under which Australia and New Zealand are comprehended. Here, as in South Africa, in Canada, and in India, England appeared late on the ground. The Spaniards and the Dutch had both preceded her. The presence of the Dutch is witnessed by the names New Holland (the earlier name of Australia) and New Zealand attaching to the greater islands.

coming periods of history this new Britain will hold some such place in the Pacific as the motherland now holds in the Atlantic.

735. **England in Asia.** — We have noted the founding of the British Empire in India (sec. 540). Throughout the nineteenth century England steadily advanced the frontiers of her dominions here and consolidated her power until by the close of the century she had brought either under her direct rule or under her suzerainty more than three hundred millions of Asiatics,[10] — the largest number of human beings, so far as history knows, ever united under a single scepter.

We must here note how England's occupation of India and her large interests in the trade of Southern and Eastern Asia involved her during the century in several wars and shaped in great measure her foreign policies. One of the earliest of these wars was that known as the Afghan War of 1838–1842, into which she was drawn through her jealousy of Russia.[11]

At the same time England became involved in the so-called Opium War with China[12] (1839–1842). As a result of this war England obtained by cession from China the island and port of Hongkong, which she has made one of the most important commercial and naval stations of her empire. In 1901 over twenty-four thousand vessels entered the ports of the island.

Scarcely was the Opium War ended before England was involved in a gigantic struggle with Russia, — the Crimean War, already spoken of in connection with Russian history (sec. 722). From our present standpoint we can better understand

[10] By the census of 1911 the population of the British Indian Empire (this includes the feudatory states) was 315,156,396.

[11] England's endeavor here was to maintain Afghanistan as a buffer state between her Indian possessions and the expanding Russian Empire. There was a second Afghan War in 1879–1880.

[12] The opium traffic between India and China had grown into gigantic proportions and had become a source of wealth to the British merchants and of revenue to the Indian government. The Chinese government, however, awake to the evils of the growing use of the narcotic, resisted the importation of the drug. This was the cause of the war. In 1907 an agreement was made between China and England in which the importation of opium into China from India was to be annually reduced in amount. This agreement was renewed in 1911, with a view to the extinction of the trade within the following ten years.

why England threw herself into the conflict on the side of Turkey. She fought to maintain the integrity of the Ottoman Empire in order that her own great rival, Russia, might be prevented from seizing Constantinople and the Bosporus, and from that point controlling the affairs of Asia through the command of the Eastern Mediterranean.

The echoes of the Crimean War had barely died away before England was startled by the most alarming intelligence from the country for the secure possession of which English soldiers had borne their part in the fierce struggle before Sevastopol.

In 1857 there broke out in the armies of the East India Company what is known as the Sepoy Mutiny.[13] Fortunately many of the native regiments stood firm in their allegiance to England, and with their aid the revolt was speedily crushed. As a consequence of the mutiny the government of India was by act of Parliament taken out of the hands of the East India Company and vested in the English crown.

There are without question offsets to the indisputably good results of English rule in India; nevertheless it is one of the most important facts of modern history, and one of special import as bearing on our present study, that over three hundred millions of the population of Asia should thus have passed, whether for better or for worse, under the rule and wardship of a European nation.

[13] The causes of the uprising were various. The crowd of deposed princes was one element of discontent. A widespread conviction among the natives, awakened by different acts of the English, that their religion was in danger was another of the causes that led to the rebellion. There were also military grievances of which the native soldiers complained. The mutiny broke out simultaneously at different points. The atrocities committed by the rebels at Cawnpur sent a thrill of horror throughout the civilized world. Nana Sahib had slain the garrison and crowded about two hundred English women and children into a small chamber. They were spared the fate of the prisoners in the Black Hole of Calcutta (sec. 540, n. 14), but only to meet a more terrible one. Fearing that the English forces, advancing by forced marches under General Henry Havelock, would effect a rescue of the prisoners, Nana Sahib employed five assassins to go into the room with their swords and knives and kill them all. The work required two hours. Then the bodies were dragged out and flung into a neighboring well, where they were found by the rescuing party, which arrived just too late to prevent the tragedy.

736. England in South Africa; Boer and Briton. — England has played a great part in the partition of Africa, and has secured the largest share of the spoils, not as to the size of her portion but as to its real value. Her first appearance upon the continent both in Egypt and at the Cape was brought about through her solicitude for her East India possessions and the security of her routes thither. Later she joined in the scramble of European powers for African territories for their own sake.

The Dutch had preceded the English in South Africa. They began their settlement at the Cape about the middle of the seventeenth century in the great days of Holland. During the French Revolution and again during Napoleon's ascendancy the English took the Dutch colony under their protection. After the downfall of Napoleon in 1814 the colony was ceded to England by the Netherlands.[14]

The Dutch settlers refused to become reconciled to the English rule. In 1836 a large number of these aggrieved colonists took the heroic resolve of abandoning their old homes and going out into the African wilderness in search of new ones. This was a resolution worthy of their ancestry, for these African Pilgrims were descendants of those Dutch patriots who fought so heroically against Philip II, and of Huguenot refugees who in the seventeenth century fled from France to escape the tyranny of Louis XIV (sec. 449).

This migration is known as "The Great Trek."[15] The immigrants journeyed from the Cape towards the northeast, driving their herds before them and carrying their women and children and all their earthly goods in great clumsy ox carts. Beyond the Orange River some of the immigrants unyoked their oxen and set up homes, laying there the basis of the Orange Free State; the more intrepid "trekked" still farther to the north, across the Vaal River, and established the republic of the Transvaal.

[14] After the loss of the Cape Settlement the island of Java was the most important colonial possession remaining to the Dutch. Gradually they got possession of the greater part of the large island of Sumatra. These two islands form the heart of the Dutch East Indies of to-day, which embrace a native population of about 36,000,000.

[15] *Trek* is Dutch for "migration" or "journey."

Two generations passed, a period filled for the little republics, surrounded by hostile African tribes, with anxieties and fighting. Then there came a turning point in their history. In the year 1885 gold deposits of extraordinary richness were discovered in the Transvaal. Straightway there began a tremendous inrush of miners and adventurers from all parts of the globe.

A great portion of these newcomers were English-speaking people. As aliens — *Uitlanders*, "outlanders," they were called — they were excluded from any share in the government, although they made up two thirds of the population of the little state and paid the greater part of the taxes. They demanded the franchise. The Boers, under the lead of the sturdy President of the Transvaal, Paul Krüger, refused to accede to their demands, urging that this would mean practically the surrender of the independence of the Republic and its annexation to the British Empire.

The controversy grew more and more bitter and soon ripened into war between England and the Transvaal (1899). The Orange Free State joined its little army to that of its sister state, — an act in which James Bryce declares there was "an heroic quality not surpassed by anything in the history of the classical peoples."[16]

At the outset the Boers, who are very expert with their rifles, were everywhere successful, inflicting one disastrous defeat after another upon the English forces, while the world looked on in amazement. The British Empire in Africa was threatened with destruction. England was stirred as she had not been stirred since the Sepoy Mutiny in India. An army of three hundred thousand men, gathered from all parts of the British Empire, was hastily thrown into South Africa, and the supreme command intrusted to the able and experienced general, Lord Roberts. After the maintenance of the struggle for over two years the last of the Boer bands surrendered (1902). As the outcome of the war both of the republics were annexed to the British Empire under the names of the Transvaal Colony and Orange River Colony.

[16] The total European or white population of the two little republics that thus threw down the gage of battle to the most powerful empire of modern times was only a little over 300,000.

Only a few years had passed after the close of the war when the British government very wisely granted the two colonies self-government. Straightway these states and Cape Colony with Natal joined in the creation of a federal commonwealth under the name of the Union of South Africa[17] (1910). Thus was consummated the favorite project of the South African statesman Cecil Rhodes (1853–1902), the "empire builder," one of the most masterful men of his generation.

The act of the British government in intrusting the Boers with responsible government won in such measure their loyalty to the Empire that at the outbreak of the great European war in 1914 they rallied — though not quite unanimously — to the support of England, and in the name of the Empire conquered German Southwest Africa and German East Africa.

One of the most important enterprises of the English in Africa is the building of a Cape-to-Cairo railroad. This, like the political scheme of a federation, was also a favorite project of Cecil Rhodes. Already his dream has been in great part realized. The projected line has been carried forward from Cape Town over fifteen hundred miles to the celebrated Victoria Falls on the Zambezi, while at the other end of the continent the road has been pushed up the Nile from Cairo to Khartum, a distance of over thirteen hundred miles (including a little over two hundred miles of river navigation above Assuan). This railroad when completed, as without doubt it will be at a date not remote, will be a potent factor in the opening up of the Dark Continent to civilization.

737. England in Egypt. — In 1876 England and France, in order to secure against loss their subjects who were holders of Egyptian bonds, established a joint control over Egypt which at that time was nominally a hereditary principality under the suzerainty of the Ottoman Porte. A few years later there broke out in the Egyptian army a mutiny against the

[17] The population of the Union according to the census of 1911 is about 7,000,000, of which about 1,250,000 are Europeans and the rest native or colored. Gold and diamond mining is the leading industry.

authority of the Khedive. France declining to act with England in suppressing the disorder, England moved alone in the matter. As a result the Anglo-French control became a sole British control.[18]

In 1885 a second expedition had to be sent out to the same country. The Sudanese, subjects of the Khedive, had revolted and were threatening the Egyptian garrisons in the Sudan with destruction. An Anglo-Egyptian army pushed its way up the Nile to the relief of Khartum, which General Gordon, the modern English knight-errant, was holding against the Mahdi, the military prophet and leader of the Sudanese Arabs. The expedition arrived too late, Khartum having fallen just before relief reached the town. Gordon perished with most of his followers.

The English troops were now recalled and the Sudan was abandoned to the rebel Arabs. For over a decade this southern land remained under the cruel rule of the Mahdi and his successor. The country was devastated by fire and sword, and Egypt was continually harassed by raids of the dervishes.

Finally in 1896 the English sent up the Nile another expedition under General Kitchener for the recovery of the lost territory. The undertaking was successful, and the Eastern Sudan and a vast territory embracing the basin of the Nile and its tributaries were again brought under the rule of the Khedive, that is to say, under the administrative control of England (1898).

No part of the world has benefited more by European control than Egypt. When England assumed the administration of its affairs it was in every respect one of the most wretched of the lands under the rule, actual or nominal, of the Turkish Sultan. The country is now, according to the claims of eminent English authority, more prosperous than at any previous period of its history, not excepting the time of the rule of the Pharaohs. This high degree of prosperity has been secured mainly through England's having given Egypt the two things declared necessary to its prosperity, — "justice and water."

[18] In the first year of the World War, Turkey having entered the war on the side of Germany, Great Britain declared an actual protectorate over Egypt.

The construction of the great irrigation or storage dam across the Nile at the First Cataract (at Assuan) is one of the greatest engineering achievements of modern times. The dam retains the surplus waters of the Nile in flood times and releases them gradually during the months of low water. This constant supply of water for irrigation purposes will, it is estimated, increase by a third the agricultural capabilities of Egypt not only by greatly augmenting the area of fertile soil but by making it possible on much of the land to raise two and even three crops each year.

III. The Expansion of France

738. France in Africa. — At the opening of the nineteenth century France possessed only fragments of a once promising colonial empire. From the long Napoleonic Wars she emerged too exhausted to give any attention for a time to interests outside of the homeland.

When finally she began to look about her for over-the-sea territories to make good her losses in America and Asia, it was the North African shore which on account of proximity (it is only twenty-four hours distant by steam from the southern ports of France), climate, and products naturally attracted her attention. This region possesses great agricultural resources. In ancient times it was one of the richest grain-tribute-paying provinces of the Roman Empire. Its climate is favorable for Latin-European settlement. It is really geographically a part of Europe, "the true Africa beginning with the Sahara."

France began the conquest of Algeria as early as 1830. The subjugation of the country was not effected without much hard fighting with the native tribes and a great expenditure in men and money. In the year 1881, under the necessity of defending her Algerian frontier against the raids of the mountain tribes of Tunis on the east, France sent troops into that country and established a protectorate over it. This act of hers deeply offended the Italians, who had had their eye upon this district,

180
160
140
120
100
80
60
40
20
Grant Land
Greely Land
ARCTIC
OCEAN
GREENLAND
(Danish)
Parry Is.
Melville Sound
Banks I.
Baffin Bay
Baffin Land
Davis Strait
Hudson Strait
Hudson Bay
Labrador Peninsula
Cape Farewell
Farõe Is
(Da
Britis
IRE
Prince of Wales
Dawson
ALASKA
Nome
DOMINION OF CANADA
Sitka
Aleutian Is.
NORTH AMERICA
Vancouver
Winnipeg
Quebec
Ottawa
Seattle
The Great Lakes
Chicago
Boston
Newfoundland
St.Johns
Halifax
GREAT
ATLANTIC
New York
UNITED STATES
Philadelphia
Washington
San Francisco
St.Louis
New Orleans
Azores
Madeira Is.
Canary Is.
OCEAN
Bermudas
PACIFIC
Bahama Islands
Havana
MEXICO
WEST INDIES
Cuba
Porto Rico (U.S.)
St. Thomas
Jamaica
Haiti
Martinique
Trinidad
C.Verde Is.
C. Verde
PORT. GUINEA
FR. GUINEA
SIERRA LEO
LIB
Hawaii
Honolulu (U.S.)
OCEAN
CENTRAL AMERICA
HONDURAS
VENEZUELA
GUIANA
COLOMBIA
Panama
Howland I. (U.S.)
Baker I. (U.S.)
Union Group
Tutuila I.
Samoa (U.S.)
Society Is.
Tahiti I.
ECUADOR
SOUTH AMERICA
PERU
BRAZIL
BOLIVIA
C.St.Roque
Ascension
Equato
Rio de Janeiro
PARAGUAY
Cook Is.
Tropic of Capricorn
Valparaiso
Santiago
CHILE
URUGUAY
Montevideo
Buenos Aires
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
Falkland Is.
Strait of Magellan
Cape Horn
South Georgia
Sandwich Group
South Orkney Is.
South Shetland I.
Scale of Geographical Miles.
On the Equator
0 500 1000
On the 30th Parallel
0 500 1000
On the 60th Parallel
0 500 1000
M.-N. WORKS, BUFFALO
Longitude 100 West from 80 Greenwich 60

EUROPEAN EXPANSION

ANGLO-SAXON: Great Britain, United States,

LATIN: France, Italy, Spain etc. Indep't Latin Countries,

SLAVONIC: Russia,

Germany, Other European Countries and their Colonies,

This Map is intended to show: First, how great a portion of the world has come to be occupied or to be dominated by peoples of European descent; and, second, to indicate particularly the relative areas held by Saxon, Latin, and Slav.

regarding it as belonging to them by virtue of its geographical position as well as its historical traditions.[19]

These North African territories form the most promising portion of France's new colonial empire. The more sanguine of her statesmen entertain hopes of ultimately creating here a new home for the French people, — a sort of New France. In any event it seems certain that all these shore lands, which in the seventh century were severed from Europe by the Arabian conquests, are now again permanently reunited to that continent and are henceforth to constitute virtually a part of the European world.

Besides these lands in North Africa, France possesses a vast domain in the region of the Senegal and lays claim to all the Sahara lying between her colony of Senegal and Algeria. She also holds extensive territories just north of the Congo Free State, embracing part of Central Sudan. The island of Madagascar also forms a part of the French-African empire.

It is to be feared that France will not find in Africa any such valuable possessions as in the eighteenth century she lost to England in America and Asia. Yet she has entered upon the work of opening up and developing her African empire with characteristic enthusiasm and expansiveness of plans. She has projects that aim at the redemption, by means of artesian wells, of extensive tracts of the Sahara. It is thought not impracticable to create a line of these oases across the Sahara from the city of Constantine in Algeria to Timbuktu in the Sudan, and thus to facilitate the construction of a projected Trans-Saharan railway.

739. France in Asia. — In the year 1862 France secured a foothold near the mouth of the Cambodia River in Indo-China and has since then steadily enlarged her possessions until now she

[19] Disappointed in not getting Tunis, the Italians sought to secure a foothold on the Red Sea coast. They seized here a district and organized it under the name of the Colony of Eritrea; but they had hard luck almost from the first. The coast is hot and unhealthy and inland is the kingdom of Abyssinia. Over this the Italians attempted to establish a protectorate; but unfortunately for them Abyssinia does not regard herself as one of the uncivilized or moribund states over which it is necessary for Europeans to extend their protection. King Menelik of that country inflicted upon the Italian army a most disastrous defeat (1896). For something regarding the seizure by the Italians of Tripoli in North Africa, see Supplemental Chapter XLV, sec. 775.

holds in those quarters territories which exceed in extent the homeland. A chief aim of the French in this region is to secure the trade of Southern China. To this end they are projecting the extension northward into China of the system of railways they have already constructed.

With these ample African and Asiatic territories France feels in a measure consoled for her losses in the past. As a colonizing state, however, France has one great handicap. She has never had a rapidly increasing population at home from which to augment her colonies. Nor have her citizens that restless, adventurous spirit of the Anglo-Saxons which has driven them as conquerors and settlers into the remotest parts of the earth and made England the mother of innumerable colonies and states.

IV. The Expansion of Germany

740. German Emigrants lost to Germany. — No country of Europe during the expansion movement of the nineteenth century supplied a greater number of emigrants for the settlement of transoceanic lands than Germany. But Germany did not until recently possess under her own flag any over-the-sea territories, and consequently the vast number of emigrants she sent out sought homes in the United States, in the different English colonies, in the Spanish and Portuguese republics of South America, and even in the Asiatic provinces of the Ottoman Empire. Thus it happened that although Germany during the century sent out vast swarms of emigrants no true Greater Germany grew up outside of Europe.

Stimulated by the successful war of 1870–1871 against France, and the consolidation of the German Empire, German statesmen began to dream of making Germany a world power. To this end it was deemed necessary to secure for Germany colonies where the German emigrants might live under the German flag and, instead of contributing to the growth and prosperity of rival states, should remain Germans and constitute a part of the German nation.

741. Germany in Africa. — Consequently when the competition came for African territory Germany entered into the struggle with great zeal and got a fair share of the spoils. In 1884 she declared a protectorate over a large region on the southwest coast of the continent just north of the Orange River, and thus lying partly in the temperate zone. This region she opened up to civilization by the construction of a railroad over two hundred and thirty miles in length running from the west coast inland.[20]

At almost the same time she established two smaller protectorates in the tropic belt farther to the north. On the East African coast she seized a great territory, twice as large as Germany itself, embracing a part of the celebrated Lake District. These upland regions are well adapted to European settlement and must in time be filled by people of European descent.

742. Germany in Asia. — The hopes of many German expansionists were centered in Western Asia rather than in Africa. Thousands of Germans crowded into Asia Minor and Syria and formed in some districts an important element of the industrial and trading population. It is said to have been the hope of William II that ultimately Asia Minor and Syria would come to form a part of the German Empire. If the process of the Germanization of those regions had continued, it is not at all unlikely that a large part of Western Asia would have come eventually into very close political as well as economic relations with Germany.

One of the most important projects of the Germans in these Asian regions was the extension of the Anatolian Railway from Konieh in Asia Minor down the Euphrates valley to Bagdad on the lower Tigris. Such a line would have greatly enhanced German influence in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, but this dream of dominion was shattered by the war of 1914 when the English armies gained complete control of the country. This railway when completed will open up the wonderfully fertile regions

[20] In 1904 the German government was forced to face a serious revolt of some of the native tribes of the protectorate, which was suppressed only after three years of cruel warfare.

which formed the heart and core of the early and populous empires of the Assyrian and the Babylonian kings.[21]

German expansion, prior to the outbreak of the great war of 1914, pressed not only on the Turkish Empire but upon the Chinese Empire as well. In 1897 Germany, on the pretext of protecting German missionaries in China, seized the port of Kiau-chau and forced its practical cession from the Chinese government. This is a spot of great political and commercial importance.[22]

Such was the position of Germany in the colonial world at the end of the nineteenth century. Before the second decade of the twentieth century had fairly opened, there came the startling revelation that German colonial enterprises and economic undertakings, particularly those in Asian Turkey, concealed political ambitions and military plans whose aims were nothing less than world domination.

V. The Expansion of Russia

743. Russia's Outward Movement. — Russia has large and numerous inland lakes and seas and vast rivers, but she lacks seaboard. Her effort to reach the sea in different directions is, as we have learned, the key to much of her history. It is this which gave a special character to nineteenth-century Russian expansion, — which made it a movement by land instead of by sea, as in the case of all the other European states that had a part in the great expansion movement.

The expansion of Russia was one of the most striking features of the great European development which we are following. Her conquests and colonizations put her in possession of about one seventh of the habitable earth and made her one of the most potent political factors in the modern world.

[21] Along with this railway project is being discussed a proposal for the restoration of the ancient irrigation works of the Tigris and Euphrates region. What has already been done for Egypt by the building of the great storage Nile dam at Assuan will almost certainly at no remote date be repeated here in what was formerly the "Asian Egypt."

[22] Besides the colonial possessions named, Germany at the beginning of the great war held a number of islands and groups of islands in the Pacific.

744. Russian Expansion in Asia; her Three Lines of Advance. — Throughout the nineteenth century Russia steadily gravitated towards the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, and the Pacific. Only in Europe was her glacier-like movement much impeded by the obstacles placed in her path by the jealousy of the other European powers. She made no material territorial gains in Europe, aside from the acquisition of Finland and part of Prussian Poland, during the nineteenth century, though she fought in three great wars for this end and shattered into fragments a great part of the Turkish Empire which lay between her and the chief goal of her ambition — the Mediterranean.

But in Asia the additions which Russia made to her empire during the nineteenth century were not only immense in extent but most important to her politically and commercially. These annexations will best be remembered if we bear in mind the three chief objects Russia had in view in her Asiatic acquisitions. These were the securing of an outlet on the Persian Gulf, the opening of an overland route to India, and the securing of ice-free ports on the Pacific.

In pursuit of the first object Russia, during the nineteenth century, conquered and absorbed the Caucasus and the Transcaucasian region. She thus dominated Northern Persia, and it is surmised that she secretly secured from the Persian government the lease of Bender Abbas on the Persian Gulf and the concession for the construction of a railway across Persia from the Caspian Sea to this southern port.[23] Thus Russia's expansion in this quarter gave her a commanding position in Western Asia which made her a formidable competitor with Germany and England for the political control of Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, and Persia.

After Russia's failure in the Crimean War and in the war of 1878 against Turkey to secure Constantinople, she began "searching in the deserts of Central Asia for the key to the

[23] But England stood guard here just as she did at the Dardanelles. She declared a sort of Monroe Doctrine for the Persian Gulf and warned off Russia and all other powers. She had good ground for her action, for the establishment of a Russian naval station on the Persian Gulf would have destroyed the security of England's route to India by way of the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean.

Bosporus"; that is to say, Russia's policy was to push her outposts within striking distance of India, not with a view to wresting that country from England, but with the object of gaining a strong position from which she might sometime dictate terms to England respecting the disposition of the estate of the "sick man" of the Bosporus.[24]

Thus during the latter half of the nineteenth century Russia steadily pushed forward her boundaries in Central Asia. She conquered or conciliated the tribes of Turkestan and advanced her frontier in this quarter far towards the south, — close up against Afghanistan. In the very heart of the continent her outposts were now established upon the lofty table-lands of the Pamirs, the "Roof of the World." Here her frontier and that of the British Empire were only twenty miles apart. The apprehension with which Russia's steady advance in these regions was viewed by England is shown by the constant efforts she made to prevent Russian influence from becoming dominant in Afghanistan and to increase her own influence in that quarter.[25]

In the extreme eastern part of Asia, Russia obtained from China the lease of Port Arthur (1898), one of the most important Asiatic harbors on the Pacific, and occupied the large Chinese province of Manchuria, which occupation it was generally believed would end in the actual annexation of that magnificent domain to the Russian Empire. Manchuria is probably better adapted to European settlement than any other thinly peopled region in Asia, and can hardly fail to become, if it remains in Russian hands, the chief center of European population in the Far East.

Thus in her expansion Russia not only subjugated the wild nomadic tribes of Northern and Central Asia, but she also wrested territories from the three semi-civilized states of the continent, —

[24] This was the political motive actuating Russia in making her acquisitions in these regions. There were of course many other grounds for her activity. She wanted to secure lands for the settlement of her peasant colonists; she must needs in self-defense establish order among the restless and plundering tribes on her frontier; and she wanted to open up a route by which to reach the markets of India and draw to herself at least a part of the trade of British India.

[25] See sec. 735, n. 11.

Turkey, Persia, and China, — and crowded heavily upon all these countries, besides threatening to absorb the buffer state of Afghanistan. She overshadowed Europe and dominated Asia. It is not a matter of wonder that the steady growth of this "Colossus of the North" awakened the apprehension of the rulers of India and influenced them to thwart her apparently boundless ambition in every possible way.

The outward movement we have traced gave Russia a physical basis which insured her a rapid and unimpeded development. It made her a competitor for a place among the three or four probable world powers of the future. It made pertinent the question, Will Slav or Saxon mold the destinies of the coming time?

745. The Trans-Siberian Railway. — Russia's most noteworthy undertaking in connection with her Asiatic empire was the building of the Trans-Siberian Railway, which connects Moscow with Vladivostok, the Russian port on the Pacific. This was one of the most gigantic enterprises of its kind of our age. The building of this road has done as much as any other single achievement of the past century to make the world small. Its effect upon political relations in the Far East is profound. It caused Russia to face the Pacific. It made accessible to Russian settlers the vast fertile regions of Southern Siberia, and will be one of the chief factors in ultimately rendering that country a part of the civilized world; for though it may be true as to the past that "civilization has come riding on a gun carriage," now it comes riding on a locomotive.

VI. The Expansion of the United States

746. The Growth of the United States a Part of the Great European Expansion Movement. — At first view it might seem that the growth of our own country should not be given a place in the present chapter. But the expansion of the United States is as truly a part of European expansion as is the increase of the English race in Canada, or in Australasia, or in South Africa. The circumstance that the development here has taken place since

the severance of all political ties binding this country to the motherland is wholly immaterial. The Canadian, Australian, and African developments have as a matter of fact been expansion movements from practically secondary and independent centers of European settlement.

Hence to complete our survey of the movement which has put in possession or in control of the European peoples so much of the earth, we must note — we can simply note — the expansion during the past century of the great American Commonwealth.

747. How the Territorial Acquisitions of the United States and its Growth in Population have contributed to assure the Predominance of the Anglo-Saxon Race in Greater Europe. — Six times during the nineteenth century the United States materially enlarged her borders.[26] These gains in territory were in the main at the expense of a Latin race, — the Spanish. They have not therefore resulted in an actual increase in the possessions of the European peoples, but have simply contributed to the predominance, or have marked the growing predominance, in this new-forming European world of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Of even greater significance than the territorial expansion of the United States during the past century is the amazing growth of the Republic during this period in population and in material and intellectual resources. At the opening of the century the white population of the United States was a little over four millions; it has now risen to about one hundred millions. This is the largest aggregate of human force and intelligence that the world has yet seen. Even more impressive than its actual are its

[26] Just at the end of the century the territorial expansion of the United States assumed a character altogether unlike that which up to that time it had retained. All our chief earlier acquisitions were lands contiguous to our previous possessions, were unoccupied or practically unoccupied, were adapted to European settlement, and were secured with the intention of making them into territories which might ultimately be carved into states and made an integral part of the Federal Union. But in 1898, as an outcome of our war with Spain, we acquired Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands. In the latter islands we came into possession of lands already peopled with an Asiatic race, and, moreover, lands unfitted for settlement by people of European stock. The acquisition by the United States of these Asiatic tropical dependencies has created for our government and our people many problems, some of which still remain unsolved.

potential capacities. With practically unlimited room for expansion by reason of the territorial acquisitions we have noted, it is impossible adequately to realize into what, during the coming centuries, the American people will grow.

This remarkable growth of an English-speaking nation on the soil of the New World has contributed more than anything else, save the expansion of Great Britain into Greater Britain, to lend impressiveness and import to the movement indicated by the expression, "European expansion."

VII. Situations and Problems created by the European Race Expansion

748. **Shall China be partitioned?** — The outward movement of the European peoples which we have now traced in broad outlines has raised several of the most serious problems that civilization has ever faced, and has created situations well calculated while awakening profound apprehensions to create also vast hopes.

One of the problems raised is altogether like the old (and yet ever new) problem — the so-called Eastern Question. It is, What shall be done with the "sick man" of the Far East? Shall China be partitioned?

This question we repeat has been raised by the great European race expansion and can be understood only when viewed as a result of the pressure of the Occidental upon the Oriental world. In the following paragraphs we shall endeavor in the briefest way possible to put in their causal and logical relations the series of events forming the antecedents and the causes of the present situation in Eastern Asia.

749. **The Awakening of Japan.** — Bearing directly upon the question of the future of China is the recent wonderful awakening of Japan. At the middle of the nineteenth century Japan was a hermit nation. She jealously excluded foreigners and refused to enter into diplomatic relations with the Western powers. But in the year 1854 Commodore Perry of the United States secured from the Japanese government concessions which

opened the country to Western influences, under which Japan soon awoke to a new life.

During the last half century the progress made by Japan on all lines, political, material, and intellectual, has been something without a parallel in history. She has transformed her ancient feudal divine-right government into a representative constitutional system modeled upon the political institutions of the West. She has adopted almost entire the material side of the civilization of the Western nations and has eagerly absorbed their sciences.



FIG. 109. — THE IMPERIAL REGALIA OF JAPAN[27] (After a drawing by *Goji Ukita*)

But what has taken place, it should be carefully noted, is not a Europeanization of Japan. The new Japan is an evolution of the old. The Japanese to-day in their innermost life, in their deepest instincts, and in their modes of thought are still an Oriental people.

750. Chino-Japanese War of 1894; a Mongolian Monroe Doctrine. — In 1894 came the war between Japan and China. A chief cause of this war was China's claim to suzerainty over Korea and her efforts to secure control of the affairs of that country. But under the conditions of modern warfare, and particularly in view of the Russian advance in Eastern Asia, the maintenance of Korea as an independent state seems to Japan absolutely necessary to the security of her island empire. The situation is vividly pictured in these words of Okakura-Kakuzo, the author of *The Awakening of Japan:*

[27] This regalia consists of a mirror, a sword, and several tusk-shaped jewels. Of all the royal or imperial regalias in the world, this is the simplest, and the most symbolic and historically interesting. According to Japanese legend, the imperial emblems were a gift of the Sun-goddess to an ancestor of the first Emperor of Japan. The goddess accompanied the bestowal of the symbols with these words: "Look upon this mirror as if it were my own spirit, and reverence it as you would my own

RUSSIAN EMPIRE
SEA OF OKHOTSK
MANCHURIA
MONGOLIA
CHINA
KOREA
JAPAN
EMPIRE
SEA OF JAPAN
YELLOW SEA
EASTERN SEA (Tung-hai)
Chita
Blagovestchensk
Amur
Khabarovsk
Gulf of Tartary
Sakhalin Island
La Perouse Strait
Tsitsihar
Sungari
Harbin
Chang-chun
Kirin
Vladivostok
Yezo
Hakodate
Hirosaki
Tie-ling
Mukden
Liao-yang
Niu-chwang
Liao-tung
Gulf of Liao-tung
Pechili
Gulf of Pechili
Peking
Tientsin
Liau-tung
Hai-yang-tao
Korea Bay
Port Arthur
Ping-yang
Chiu-nam-po
Wen-san
Seoul
Chemulpo
Chi-fo
Shan-tung Prom.
Tsi-nan
Wei-hai-wei (Britain)
SHAN-TUNG
Kiau-chau Bay (Germany)
Mok-po
Fusan
Tsushima
Kiushiu
Kyoto
Tokio
Yokohama
Nagoya
Yokosuka
Osaka
Shimonoseki
Kokura
Saseho
Nagasaki
Kumamoto
Kagoshima
Nankin
Shanghai
Yang-tse-kiang
Cable
Ning-po
Fu-chau
Lu-Chu Is.
Riu-Kiu
Formosa Strait
Formosa
Pescadores
THE FAR EAST
0 50 100 200 300
Scale of Miles
THE M·N. WORKS
Society Bay
Milne I.
Murchison I.
Kin-chau
Ta-lien-wan
Ta-lien-wan Bay
Dalny
Reef I.
Pigeon Bay
Port Arthur
Sanshan-tau I.
C. Liao-ti-shan
0 5 10 20
Scale of Miles

"Any hostile power," he says, "in occupation of the peninsula might easily throw an army into Japan, for Korea lies like a dagger ever pointed toward the very heart of Japan."

Still again, realizing that greed of territory would lead the European powers sooner or later to seek the partition of China and the political control of the Mongolian lands of the Far East, Japan wished to stir China from her lethargy, make herself her adviser and leader, and thus get in a position to control the affairs of Eastern Asia. In a word she was resolved to set up a sort of Monroe Doctrine in her part of the world, which should close Mongolian lands against European encroachments and preserve for Asiatics what was still left of Asia.

The war was short and decisive. It was a fight between David and Goliath. China with her great inert mass was absolutely helpless in the hands of her tiny antagonist. With the Japanese army in full march upon Peking the Chinese government was forced to sue for peace. China now recognized the independence of Korea, and ceded to Japan Formosa and the extreme southern part of Manchuria, including Port Arthur. But at this juncture of affairs, Russia, supported by France and Germany, jealously intervened.

presence. For centuries upon centuries shall thy descendants rule this kingdom. Govern this country with purity like that of the light that radiates from the surface of the mirror. Deal with thy subjects with the gentleness typified by the bland and soft luster of the jewels. Combat the enemies of thy empire with this sword." No other royal regalia is so intimately related to the national life of a people as are these sacred emblems of Japan. Respecting this we quote from a most interesting paper on the subject, read before the Japan Society of London, in 1902, by Mr. Ukita, Chancellor of the Imperial Japanese Legation: "In conclusion, I should like to say one word in regard to the significance of the regalia in the mind of the Japanese people. The emblems, as I have pointed out, symbolize Knowledge, Courage, and Mercy; and it has always been held that unless a ruler be possessed of all these three virtues, he will be powerless to govern the country in peace and prosperity. With this in mind, the importance of the regalia, which symbolizes these three virtues, can be easily imagined. Its influence on the people is enormous. Coming from the gods to Zimmu, the first Emperor, himself a descendant of the gods, its existence dates from the very foundation of the Japanese Empire. Without it, the Empire would hardly be conceivable to the Japanese people. The whole tradition of the imperial family is bound up in it; its possession bestows sovereignty by divine right; and the instinct of the people . . . is to acknowledge no man as Emperor unless he possess the regal symbols." See *Transactions and Proceedings of the Japan Society* (London) for 1901–1902, vol. vi.

These powers forced Japan to accept a money indemnity in lieu of territory on the continent. She was permitted, however, to take possession of the island of Formosa.

751. China in Process of Dismemberment; the Boxer Uprising (1900). — The march of the little Japanese army into the heart of the huge Chinese Empire was in its consequences something like the famous march of the Ten Thousand Greeks through the great Persian Empire. It revealed the surprising weakness of China — a fact known before to all the world but never so perfectly realized as after the Japanese exploit — and marked her out for partition. The process of dismemberment began without unnecessary delay.

Germany seized the port of Kiau-chau[28] (sec. 742) and forced from China a ninety-nine years' lease of it (January, 1898). She lost this to Japan in 1915.

Russia asked and received a twenty-five years' lease of Port Arthur (March, 1898). This also passed to Japan at the end of the Russo-Japanese War (1905). In April, 1898, England demanded and received from China Wei-hai-wei.

France, viewing these cessions to Germany, Russia, and England with natural uneasiness, immediately sought and obtained from China as compensation a ninety-nine years' lease of the Bay of Kwang-chau-wan (April, 1898).

Italy was now reported to have made demands upon the Chinese government for something as compensation to her for what the other powers had received. The press in Europe and America began openly to discuss the impending partition of the Chinese Empire and to speculate as to how the spoils would be divided.

Suddenly the whole Western world was startled by the intelligence that the legations or embassies of all the European powers at Peking were hemmed in and besieged by a Chinese mob aided by the imperial troops. Then quickly followed a report of the massacre of all the Europeans in the city.

Strenuous efforts were at once made by the different Western nations, as well as by Japan, to send an international force to the rescue of their representatives and the missionaries and other

[28] Or Kiao-chau.

Europeans with them, should it chance that any were still alive. Not since the Crusades had so many European nations joined in a common undertaking. There were in the relief army Russian, French, English, American, and German troops, besides a strong Japanese contingent. The relief column fought its way through to Peking and forced the gates of the capital. The worst had not happened, and soon the tension of the Western world, which had lasted for six weeks, was relieved by the glad news of the rescue of the beleaguered little company of Europeans.

All which it concerns us now to notice is the place which this remarkable passage in Chinese history holds in the story of European expansion which we have been rehearsing. The point of view to which our study has brought us discloses this at once.

The insurrection had at bottom for its cause the determination of the Chinese to set a limit to the encroachments of the Western races, to prevent the dismemberment of their country, to preserve China for the Chinese. All the various causes that have been assigned for the uprising are included in this general underlying cause.

752. The Chinese Republic. — As a result of the Boxer uprising China had to agree to pay an indemnity of $325,000,000. The country was humiliated, too, by the invasion of the allied troops and the flight of the court from Peking. These events aided in discrediting the Manchu dynasty, which, during the two and a half centuries of its supremacy, had given China some of its ablest rulers but had finally become weak and corrupt. Its policy of leasing territory to foreign powers and of granting them concessions for building railroads in return for large loans was strongly opposed by many patriotic Chinese. Certain governmental reforms, ineffectually carried out, added to the growing dissatisfaction with the imperial rule.

For many years revolutionary ideas had been spreading, especially among the more enlightened young men who had studied abroad. Finally, in October, 1911, an outbreak occurred in Hankow, which rapidly gained such strength that the Manchus were compelled to abdicate (February 12, 1912). A provisional republican government was inaugurated with Yuan Shih-kai as president.

Although he was considered the ablest statesman in China, he was no friend of democracy, and his arbitrary acts led to continuous conflict with the republican leaders. Open rebellion broke out in the summer of 1913; but the movement was premature, the leaders showed no statesmanlike qualities, and when the ex-Manchu general Chang Hsun captured Nanking the uprising immediately collapsed.

In October, 1913, Yuan Shih-kai was elected permanent president and was inaugurated October 10, the second anniversary of the beginning of the revolution. The republic had already been recognized by the United States and other American republics, and now European governments and Japan gave their recognition. In a few weeks the incompetency and obstructive tactics of the parliament enabled the president, with popular assent, to make himself virtually a dictator.

In the summer of 1915 a movement began for the restoration of the monarchy, and on December 11 Yuan Shih-kai announced that "in deference to the will of the people" he had consented to become emperor. But, owing to a rapidly growing rebellion of the southern provinces and probably in part to foreign influence, the change in the form of government was revoked, March 22, 1916, and upon the death of Yuan Shih-kai in June the vice-president, Li Yuan-hung, quietly succeeded to the presidency. Many old generals, led by Chang Hsun, continued to plot for the overthrow of the republic, and in July, 1917, brought about the retirement of the president; but the vice-president, Feng Kuo-chang, assumed the presidency, and the republic appeared likely to be permanent in spite of occasional military dominance.

When the European war broke out in the summer of 1914 the Japanese demanded that Germany hand over to them the leased territory of Kiau-chau. As this demand was ignored, Japan declared war and received the capitulation of Kiau-chau November 7, 1914. During the military operations the Japanese landed troops on Chinese soil, thus violating Chinese neutrality. Japan's aggressive attitude at this time and in the following months contributed to turn China's sympathy to Germany. The Chinese army, too,

which had been trained and armed by Germans, aided in spreading German propaganda.

It was the influence of the United States that finally aligned China with the enemies of Germany. On February 4, 1917, a note was received from the American government stating that it had broken off diplomatic relations with Germany as a protest against the unrestricted submarine warfare which Germany had begun February 1, and inviting the Chinese republic to take similar action. On February 9 the Chinese government dispatched a note to Berlin declaring that it would sever diplomatic relations unless Germany changed its submarine policy. This was hailed as a promising sign of virility in the young Chinese republic, as it was the first decisive action ever taken by China in regard to foreign affairs. The severance of diplomatic relations came on March 14, and after Chang Hsun's attempt to restore the monarchy had been crushed war was declared, again in response to the suggestion of the United States, August 14, 1917. Many Chinese laborers were employed in auxiliary service with the Allied armies, but China took no important part in the actual fighting.

America is greatly admired by the Chinese. It has never sought territory in China and has stood for the "open door," or the equality of all nations in commercial relations with China. It gained still further credit by returning the amount of indemnity assigned to it after the Boxer troubles of 1900, deducting only enough to pay the expenses of its military and naval operations. All the other nations that participated in the expedition to Peking have retained the full amount of indemnity awarded. Furthermore the American republic has been taken as a model for the government of the new China, and the Chinese naturally look to the people of America for sympathy and support in their efforts to establish a stable democratic government.

753. **The Russo-Japanese War** (1904–1905). — In 1902 Japan had concluded a defensive alliance with Great Britain which greatly increased her prestige in the Far East. Two years later she declared war on Russia. Respecting the profound cause of this conflict, little need be added to what has already been said in

the preceding paragraphs. Soon after Russia had forced Japan to give up Port Arthur and the territory in Manchuria ceded to her by the terms of the treaty with China after the Chino-Japanese War of 1894 (sec. 750), she herself secured from China a lease of the most "strategic portion" of this same territory, and straightway proceeded to transform Port Arthur into a great naval and military fortress, which was to be the Gibraltar of the East. Moreover she occupied the whole of the great Chinese province of Manchuria. Notwithstanding she had given her solemn pledges that the occupation of this territory should be only temporary, she not only violated these pledges but made it evident by her acts that she intended, besides making Manchuria a part of the Russian Empire, also to seize Korea. But Russian control of this stretch of seaboard and command of the Eastern seas meant that Japan would be hemmed in by a perpetual blockade and her existence as an independent nation imperiled. It would place her destiny in the hands of Russia. Japan could not accept this fate.

FIG. 110. — FIELD MARSHAL OYAMA

(From stereograph, copyright, 1904, by the H. C. White Company, New York.)

She was ready for war; her army and navy were well organized, ably commanded, and highly efficient. Hostilities commenced in February, 1904. It was the purpose of the Japanese to drive the Russians first out of the Liao-tung peninsula and then out of Manchuria. Within a few days after the declaration of war the two Russian fleets in the eastern waters were severely defeated

and bottled up, one at Port Arthur, the other at Vladivostok. Japan thus controlled the seas and could transport her troops into Korea and Manchuria. General Kuroki marched through Korea and defeated the Russians at the Yalu River. General Oku, with a second army, had landed just north of Port Arthur, but failed to capture that port by assault, and General Nogi, assisted by Admiral Togo, was left to conduct a siege. The other armies, having united under the command of Marshal Oyama, defeated the Russian commander-in-chief, Kuropatkin, who had marched to the relief of Port Arthur in September. The Russians retreated to Mukden, where from February 25 to March 10, 1905, was fought the great battle of the war. The Russians were defeated with a loss of about eighty-five thousand men; the Japanese lost about seventy thousand. On January 2, 1905, Port Arthur had surrendered after a ten months' siege.

In an effort to redeem the situation the Russian government had sent forth the Baltic fleet under Admiral Rojestvensky in October, 1904; but this fleet, after the long voyage around the Cape of Good Hope, reached the scene of hostilities only to be almost totally destroyed by Admiral Togo in the Sea of Japan, May 27, 1905.

Both nations were now desirous of peace. Japan had been victorious, but her losses in men had been severe, her war debt was heavy, and her resources were limited. Russia, though defeated, still had a large army in Manchuria, had apparently inexhaustible resources, and occupied positions difficult to attack. At the suggestion of President Roosevelt the warring nations sent delegates to Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Here, after three weeks of anxious negotiations, a treaty of peace was signed, September 5, 1905. The paramount influence of Japan in Korea was recognized;[29] Russia agreed to evacuate Manchuria, and ceded to Japan the southern half of the island of Sakhalin and the lease of the Liao-tung peninsula, including Port Arthur. Although the terms of the treaty were not satisfactory to the Japanese people, Japan had gained the immediate objects of the war and had established herself as a world power and a nation to be reckoned with.

[29] In 1910 Japan forcibly annexed Korea.

References. — In preparing the following list of books no attempt has been made to distinguish between primary and secondary authorities, for the reason that so many of the works dealing with the subject of this chapter are of a mixed character.

Works of a general character: MORRIS, *The History of Colonization.* Has a good bibliography. IRELAND, *Tropical Colonization.* This also contains a list of books relating to the subject. PAYNE, *European Colonies.* REINSCH, *Colonial Government.* KIDD, *The Control of the Tropics.* BRYCE, *The Relations of the Advanced and the Backward Races of Mankind.*

For the British Colonial Empire: SEELEY, *The Expansion of England.* EGERTON, *A Short History of British Colonial Policy.* CALDECOTT, *English Colonization and Empire.* BOURINOT, *Canada under British Rule, 1760–1900.* JENKS, *History of the Australasian Colonies.* BRYCE, *Impressions of South Africa.*

For Europe in Africa: JOHNSTON, *A History of the Colonization of Africa.* STANLEY, *Through the Dark Continent* and *The Congo and the Founding of its Free State.* KELTIE, *The Partition of Africa.* MILNER, *England in Egypt.* HUGHES, *Livingstone.* HILL, *Colonel Gordon in Central Africa.* CLOETE, *The History of the Great Boer Trek.* Cloete was the English High Commissioner for Natal in 1843–1844. PAUL KRÜGER, *Memoirs.* DE WET, *Three Years' War.*

For Russia in Asia: KENNAN, *Siberia and the Exile System.* HELLWALD, *The Russians in Central Asia.* CURZON, *Russia in Central Asia in 1889 and the Anglo-Russian Question.* COLQUHOUN, *Russia against India; the Struggle for Asia.* SHOEMAKER, *The Great Siberian Railway.* KRAUSSE, *Russia in Asia.* NORMAN, *All the Russias.* SKRINE, *The Expansion of Russia, 1815–1900.* HOSIE, *Manchuria, Its People, Resources, and Recent History.*

For the problems of the Far East, created by the European expansion movement: *China's Only Hope*, by Chang Chih Tung, Viceroy of Liang Hi. This has been pronounced by high authority "one of the most remarkable books, if not the most remarkable book, written by a Chinese during the past six hundred years." OKAKURA-KAKUZO, *The Awakening of Japan.* ASAKAWA, *The Russo-Japanese Conflict.* CURZON, *Problems of the Far East.* MAHAN, *The Problem of Asia.* LEROY-BEAULIEU, *The Awakening of the East.* COLQUHOUN, *China in Transformation* and *The Mastery of the Pacific.* REINSCH, *World Politics at the End of the Nineteenth Century as influenced by the Oriental Situation.* HORNBECK, *Contemporary Politics in the Far East.* WEALE, *The Fight for the Republic in China.*

Topics for Class Reports. — 1. Résumé of the history of the lost colonial empires of the earlier Modern Age. 2. Livingstone and Stanley. 3. Founding of the Congo Free State. 4. The Establishment of the Commonwealth of Australia. 5. The storage dam at the First Cataract of the Nile. 6. The Cape-to-Cairo Railroad. 7. France in Algeria. 8. Germany in Western Asia. 9. The Trans-Siberian Railway. 10. Asia for the Asiatics.

CHAPTER XLIV

THE WORLD STATE

Unconquerable time itself works on unceasingly, bringing the nations nearer to one another, awakening the universal consciousness of the community of mankind; and this is the natural preparation for a common organization of the world. — BLUNTSCHLI.

For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw a Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;
. . . . . .
Till the war-drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle-flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World. — TENNYSON.

754. **Introductory.** — In the opening paragraph of his suggestive work "The Expansion of England," Professor Seeley uses these words: "It is a favorite maxim of mine that history, while it should be scientific in its method, should pursue a practical object. That is, it should not merely gratify the reader's curiosity about the past, but modify his view of the present and his forecast of the future. Now if this maxim be sound, the history of England ought to end with something that might be called a moral. Some large conclusion ought to arise out of it; it ought to exhibit the general tendency of English affairs in such a way as to set us thinking about the future and divining the destiny which is reserved for us."

The inspiring destiny for England which Professor Seeley reads in her past and present history is Imperial Federation, that is, a great federal union embracing the motherland and her colonies, organized after the model of the United States of America.

Professor Seeley's maxim must needs be applied to universal history if its study is to issue in anything really worthy and practical. We must try to discover the tendency of the historic evolution, to discern the set of the current of world events, and

to divine the destiny reserved for the human race. Only thus shall we be able to form practical ideals for humanity and strive intelligently and hopefully for their realization.

The destiny of the human race, as plainly disclosed in its past history, is not disunion but union, not perpetual warfare but perpetual peace. The drift of history from the beginning has been toward a federated world, a world organized for common effort and common accomplishment.

755. **From the Clan State to the Federal State.**— There is no tendency in universal history, broadly viewed, more manifest than this tendency toward world unity. In the beginning the largest independent group was the clan or tribe. Then came the wider union of the city-state as we find it in Babylonia and Syria, and in Greece and Italy, at the dawn of history. For upwards of two thousand years the city-state was the ultimate political unit in the civilized world of the Mediterranean. Then, — if we disregard purely artificial unions, unions created and maintained by force, such as the Roman Empire, — then came the nation states of modern times, which, since the break-up of the Roman Empire, have been slowly created through the consolidation of tribes, cities, and petty principalities.

And just now among these great nation states a state of a new type has arisen, — the federal state, of which our Union, consisting of forty-eight states, is the model. Constituted "in the image and likeness" of this are the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Swiss Confederation, and the new Slav republics. So characteristic a feature, indeed, of the political life of the present is this federation movement, that ours has been called the Federal Age. "One of the most striking tendencies of the last century," writes Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, "has been the development of federal government in Europe and America." "The aspect of the whole world," writes Parkin, the author of *Imperial Federation*, "irresistibly suggests the thought that we are passing from a nation epoch to a federation epoch."

The significant thing about this federal movement is that the natural and logical issue of national federalism is international federalism. The United States of America foreshadows the

United States of Europe. The obstacles in the way of such a federation of the European nations are not so great as those which, scarcely more than a generation ago, seemed to render chimerical all attempts to build up unified nations out of the discordant elements existing in Italy and in Germany. The creation of the United States of Europe is a light task compared with the creation of the modern European nations out of the mediæval chaos of warring tribes, cities, and feudal principalities. To doubt that the work of organization, so far advanced, will stop short of full accomplishment in the formation of the larger European union, which alone can give real worth and meaning to the narrower national unions, is to doubt that the great tendencies in history are toward any ascertainable and reasonable goal.

756. Preparations in Different Domains for the World State. — The success which has attended the application of the federal principle to wide unions of states, like that of the United States, creates a reasonable hope that the same principle will be found capable of uniting in a great federation all the nations of the earth. And, in truth, during the last century, in different realms, the prerequisites of such a world union have been supplied by humanity's advance and achievements.

In the political realm all that the age-spirit has accomplished would seem to have for its ultimate aim the preparing of the way for international federation. More than a century ago Immanuel Kant, in his essay on *Perpetual Peace*, affirmed that a prerequisite for the federation of the world was the establishment by all the nations of representative government. If we recall what the union of the autocratic governments of Europe in the Holy Alliance meant (sec. 647), we shall understand why Kant made the establishment of free popular institutions within the different nations an indispensable prerequisite of the world union. A world union of despotic governments would be the tomb of liberty, individual and national, — a world-wide autocratic despotism.

When Kant wrote his plea for peace, autocratic government prevailed almost everywhere in Europe; in England alone was there the semblance of a representative constitution. We have

seen how, during the century which has passed since then, the Political Revolution has established representative government in most of the Christian states of Europe. Furthermore, in all the really vital nations and communities outside of Europe, — in the United States, in Canada, in Australia, in Japan, — the management of public affairs is in the hands of the people. Thus has the first prerequisite of the formation of the universal state been supplied in the case of almost all the great nations and communities of the civilized world.

A second significant preparation in the political realm for the world union is federalism. This supplies the principle which may be applied to the organization of the world without danger to the principle of local autonomy and legitimate national freedom; for it deprives the uniting states, as exemplified in our own Union, of nothing save that "lawless freedom" which they now use to do one another hurt and harm.

While the basis of a world state has thus been laid in the political domain through the incoming of democracy and federalism, an equally important preparation for the permanent organization of the world has been made in the moral realm. Throughout the last century the sentiment of the brotherhood of man has been vastly deepened and strengthened. There has been growing up, too, a new social conscience which recognizes the universality of the moral law, which recognizes that it is a law as binding upon nations as upon individuals. These new moral feelings constitute a force which is working irresistibly in the interest of a world union based on international amity and good will.

It is most significant that at the same time that these movements towards world unity have characterized progress in the political and moral realms, wonderful discoveries, inventions, and developments in the physical domain, — the steam railway, the steamship, the telegraph, the telephone, wireless telegraphy, and a hundred others, — through the practical annihilation of time and space, have brought the once isolated nations close alongside one another and have made easily possible, in truth, made necessary and inevitable, the formation of the world union.

757. **The Interparliamentary Union.** — One of the most important of the agencies at work for international organization is what is known as the Interparliamentary Union. This is an association made up exclusively of members of national legislatures or parliaments. Its membership now numbers more than two thousand. Because of the noble character of the men composing this international society, as well as because of their connection with the practical work of legislation in the different states, this body is the most influential of the agencies now working for the organization of the world.

758. **The International Peace Conference at The Hague and the Establishment of the International Court of Arbitration** (1899). — Already more has been accomplished in the way of the actual creation of the machinery of a world state than is generally realized. Just as the nineteenth century was closing the Tsar Nicholas surprised the world by proposing to all the governments having representatives at the Russian court the meeting of a conference "to consider means of insuring the general peace of the world and of putting a limit to the progressive increase of armaments which weigh upon all nations."

All the governments addressed accepted the proposal, and in 1899 the Convention met at The Hague in the Netherlands. The most important outcome of the deliberations of the body was the establishment of a permanent International Court of Arbitration to which all nations may have recourse for the settlement of interstate disputes.

The formation of this International Court is a most noteworthy event. In the words of a recent writer, "It may be possible that looking back a hundred years from now it will be seen that its establishment was the most important single event of modern times." Andrew Carnegie, recognizing the import of the work of the Convention for the peace of the world, has made a gift of $1,500,000 for the erection at The Hague of a permanent home for the Court, — what is to be known as "The Temple of Peace."

The first two cases to be submitted to the Court were the Pious Fund case, between the United States and Mexico, and

the Venezuela case, which concerned thirteen nations. Both of these cases were amicably settled.[1] Referring in an official message to the decision of the Court in the latter case, President Roosevelt used these words: "This triumph of the principle of international arbitration is a subject of warm congratulation, and offers a happy augury for the peace of the world." Many of the leading nations have already bound themselves by treaties to refer to the Court all controversies of a specified character arising between them.

FIG. 111.—THE CHRIST OF THE ANDES[2]
(From a photograph by Carolina Huidobro)

The creation of this International Court of Arbitration brings measurably nearer the time when the barbarous wager of battle between nations shall have become such a tradition of an outgrown past as is now the old wager of battle between individuals (sec. 47).

759. Meeting of the Second International Conference and the Proposed Creation of a Stated World Congress or Parliament. — A Supreme Court of the nations having been established, the next

[1] Many other cases have been referred to this Court, and several have been satisfactorily adjudicated.

[2] In 1903 the South American republics of Chile and Argentina, having happily settled by arbitration a long-standing boundary controversy which threatened to involve the two countries in war, mutually bound themselves by treaty to reduce their military and naval armaments and for a stated period to submit every matter of dispute arising between them to arbitration. Upon one of the highest boundary ranges of the Andes the two nations have erected a colossal bronze statue of Christ as the sacred guardian of the peace to which they are pledged. The statue was unveiled March 13, 1904.

step in the organization of the world is the formation of an International Legislature. This step has already been taken. The Interparliamentary Union, at its meeting held at St. Louis in the fall of 1904, passed a resolution requesting the governments of the different nations to send representatives to a second international conference, and asking that at such conference there be considered among other matters "the advisability of establishing an International Congress to convene periodically for the discussion of international questions."

The President of the United States was requested by the Union to invite the governments of the world to send delegates to such a conference. He at once complied with the request. The invitations met with cordial responses from the governments addressed, and what is known as the Second Hague Conference met in 1907. Forty-four of the fifty and more sovereign and independent nations of the world were represented. One of the important achievements of the conference was the adoption of a proposal made by the delegates of the United States for the establishment of an International Court of Arbitral Justice, as a genuine court of law with permanent judges, to stand by the side of the Court of Arbitration created by the First Hague Conference. The jurisdiction and rules of procedure of the court were agreed upon, but unfortunately no agreement as to the number and mode of selection of the judges could be reached. Had the court been fully constituted and the submission to it of international disputes been made obligatory, it is possible that the great tragedy which overwhelmed Europe in 1914 would have been averted.

The action of the conference respecting the periodic meeting of representatives of the nations was as follows: "The conference recommends to the powers the reunion of a third peace conference, which shall take place within a period analogous to that which has elapsed since the preceding conference, at a date fixed by common agreement among the powers." There is justification for the confident hope that a third conference will be convened at The Hague very soon after the end of the present world war.

References. — BLUNTSCHLI, *The Theory of the State*, bk. i, chap. ii. SEELEY, *The Expansion of England*. KANT, *Perpetual Peace*. JEAN DE BLOCH, *The Future of War*, being the sixth volume of the author's extended work under this same title. PARKIN, *Imperial Federation*. TRUEBLOOD, *The Federation of the World*. MEAD, *A Primer of the Peace Movement*. HART, *An Introduction to the Study of Federal Government*. FISKE, *American Political Ideas*. SUMNER, *Addresses on War*. FOSTER, *Arbitration and The Hague Court*. HOLLS, *The Peace Conference at The Hague*. TOLSTOI, *War and Peace*, and *Letter on the Russo-Japanese War*. BARONESS VON SUTTNER, *Lay Down Your Arms*.

CONCLUSION

THE NEW AGE: INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

760. The Age of Material Progress or the Industrial Age. — History has been well likened to a grand dissolving view. While one age is passing away another is coming into prominence. Before the movement in the political realm which we have been following, and which is creating free self-directing nations and organizing them in a world-wide union, has yet reached its consummation, the scene is already shifting. During the last hundred years the features of a new age have distinctly appeared. A new movement of human society has begun. Civilization has fairly entered upon what may be called the Industrial Age or the Age of Material Progress.

We have already noted the beginnings of this new age in the industrial revolution effected by the great inventions which marked the latter part of the eighteenth century (sec. 544). In the decade between 1830 and 1840 the industrial development thus initiated received a great impulse through the bringing to practical perfection of several of the earlier inventions and by new discoveries and fresh inventions. Prominent among these were the steam railway, the electric telegraph, and the ocean steamship. In the year 1830 Stephenson exhibited the first really successful locomotive. In 1836 Morse perfected the telegraph. In 1838 ocean steamship navigation was first practically solved.[1]

These and other inventions which have grown out of them have brought about momentous changes in the social and the political

[1] These inventions may be compared, in their relations to the new industrial age, to the three great inventions or discoveries, namely, printing, gunpowder, and the mariner's compass, which ushered in the Modern Age (see p. 290).

world.[2] But it is only the revolution which they have wrought in the industrial domain to which we would now direct attention. And the significant fact for us here to note is that through the application of these inventions to the processes of manufacture and to the thousand other industries and activities of mankind the productive forces of society have been almost incalculably increased. Probably more things contributive to human well-being can now be produced in a single day than were produced in ten or twenty days at the opening of the century. In some important branches of manufacture the productive power of the workman, aided by machinery, has been increased a hundred and even a thousand fold.

The history of this age of industry, so different from any preceding age, cannot yet be written, for no one can tell whether the epoch is just opening or is already well advanced.[3] We shall have finished the task set ourselves when we have merely stated the leading problem which this remarkable industrial development has created, and indicated the solution of that problem which the Socialists have proposed.

761. The Labor Problem. — Beyond controversy the great problem of the epoch, one involving many others, is the so-called Labor Problem. This, plainly stated, is, How are the products of the world's industry to be equitably distributed?

The condition of things is this. Through the employment of the forces of nature and the use of improved machinery,

[2] Thus, for illustration, the increased facilities for travel, by bringing men together and familiarizing them with new scenes and different forms of society and belief, are making them more liberal and tolerant. Still again, by the virtual annihilation of time and space, governmental problems are being solved. As we have just seen, a chief difficulty in maintaining a federation of states widely separated has already been removed and such extended territories as those of the United States have been made practically as compact as the most closely consolidated European state.

[3] It may well be that we have already seen the greatest surprises of the age, so far as great inventions and discoveries are concerned, and that the epoch is nearing its culmination. "It is probable," says Professor Richard T. Ely, "that as we, after more than two thousand years, look back upon the time of Pericles with wonder and astonishment, as an epoch great in art and literature, posterity two thousand years hence will regard our era as forming an admirable and unparalleled epoch in the history of industrial invention." — *French and German Socialism in Modern Times.*

economic goods, that is, products adapted to meet the physical wants of men, can be produced in almost unlimited quantities. But this increase in society's productive power has brought little or no corresponding augmentation of material well-being to the laboring classes. Owing to some defect in our industrial system a few secure a disproportionate share of its benefits.[4] Great monopolies or trusts are created and fabulous fortunes are amassed by a few fortunate individuals, while perhaps the majority of the laborers for wages, with their toil lightened comparatively little or not at all, receive almost nothing beyond the means of narrow and bare subsistence.

This inequitable distribution of wealth, of material well-being, this practical exclusion of the masses from the greater part of the benefits and enjoyments of modern civilization, is creating everywhere the most dangerous discontent among the laboring classes and is awakening among philanthropists and statesmen the greatest solicitude and apprehension.

762. Socialism or Social Democracy. — The proposed solution of the problem which has awakened most thought and created most debate is that offered by the Socialists, or Social Democrats. Just as our own government — state, city, or national — now owns schoolhouses and controls education, owns and conducts the post office, municipal water works, and other public utilities, so would the Socialists have the government by the gradual extension of its functions come into possession of the railways, the telegraph,[5] the mines, mills, factories, the land, — in a word, of all the means of production, of all those things upon which or in connection with which human labor is spent in order to satisfy human wants and to meet human desires.

[4] According to a recent estimate 125,000 families of the wealthy class in the United States hold $33,000,000,000 of the total wealth of the nation, while 5,500,000 families of the poorer class possess only $800,000,000. To put it in another way, in every one hundred families of the nation one family holds more than the remaining ninety-nine. Nearly half the families of the nation are classed as "propertyless," that is, as having nothing save clothing and household furniture. See Spahr, *An Essay on the Present Distribution of Wealth in the United States* (1896), p. 69.

[5] In many of the countries of Europe the railways and the telegraph are already largely in the hands of the government.

The Socialists maintain that only under such a system as this — which would do away with the wage system and with private capital, though not with private property — can the present exploitation of labor by capital be made impossible and every man secured reasonable participation in the benefits of the gifts of nature and of the new inventions and discoveries which are rendering nature with all her mighty forces man's willing servant.

Socialists lay great emphasis on this, namely, that what they propose is in line and harmony with the great historic movements of the past centuries. They maintain that the democratization of wealth [6] is the logical issue of the democratization of knowledge, of religion, and of government by the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Political Revolution. For them the coming Industrial Revolution [7] is the next and necessary phase of the progressive course of civilization.

[6] It should be carefully noted that democracy in wealth does not mean communism, which denies individual rights in property, any more than democracy in religion means atheism, or democracy in politics, anarchy. It simply looks to such a reform of the present economic system as shall secure to every man an equitable proportion of the material goods which his labor helps to create, or "an apportionment of well being according to labor performed."

[7] It will be noted that to the term "Industrial Revolution" as used by the Socialists there attaches a wholly different meaning from that which it carries when used by the political economists (sec. 544). What the latter call the "Industrial Revolution" is to the Socialist only an antecedent of the real Revolution, which is still to come.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Containing the full titles of works referred to, arranged alphabetically according to authors, with the names of publishers and dates of issue. Primary works and source books form a separate list at the end of the Bibliography.

Adams, C. K., *Christopher Columbus* (Makers of America Series). N.Y., Dodd. 1892.

Adams, G. B., *Civilization during the Middle Ages.* N.Y., Scribner. 1894.

—— *The Growth of the French Nation.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1902.

Airy, O., *The English Restoration and Louis XIV.* N.Y., Scribner. 1889.

Alzog, J., *Universal Church History*, 3 vols. 5th impression. Cincinnati, Robert Clarke. 1899.

Ameer Ali, Syed, *The Spirit of Islam: or the Life and Teachings of Mohammed.* 2d ed. London, Allen. 1895.

—— *Short History of the Saracens.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1899.

Andrews, C. M., *The Historical Development of Modern Europe*, 2 vols. N.Y., Putnam. Student's ed., one vol., 1900.

—— *A History of England.* Boston, Allyn & Bacon. 1903.

Archer, T. A., and Kingsford, C. L., *The Crusades* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1900.

Armstrong, E., *The Emperor Charles V.*, 2 vols. N.Y., Macmillan. 1902.

—— *Lorenzo de' Medici and Florence in the Fifteenth Century* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1896.

Asakawa, K., *The Russo-Japanese Conflict.* Boston, Houghton. 1904.

Bain, R. N., *Charles XII and the Collapse of the Swedish Empire* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1899.

Baird, H. M., *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, 2 vols. N.Y., Scribner. 1895.

—— *History of the Rise of the Huguenots*, 2 vols. N.Y., Scribner. 1883.

—— *Theodore Beza* (Heroes of the Reformation). N.Y., Putnam. 1899.

Balmes, J., *European Civilization; Protestantism and Catholicity compared*, 19th ed. Baltimore, Murphy & Co.

Balzani, U., *The Popes and the Hohenstaufen* (Epochs of Church History). London, Longmans. 1898.

Barry, W., *The Papal Monarchy* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1902.

Bateson, M., *Mediæval England* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1904.

Beard, C., *Martin Luther and the Reformation in Germany* (to 1520). Ed. by J. F. Smith. London, Paul. 1889.

Beazley, C. R., *Prince Henry the Navigator* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1895.

Beesly, E. S., *Queen Elizabeth* (Twelve English Statesmen). London, Macmillan. 1900.

Bémont, C., and Monod, G., *Mediæval Europe, 395–1270.* N.Y., Holt. 1902.

Besant, W., *Gaspard de Coligny*. N.Y., Putnam. 1879.
Bigelow, P., *History of the German Struggle for Liberty*, 3 vols. N.Y., Harper. 1896–1904.
Blauvelt, M. T., *The Development of Cabinet Government in England*. N.Y., Macmillan. 1902.
Bloch, Jean de, *The Future of War*. Boston, Ginn. 1903.
Blok, P. J., *History of the People of the Netherlands*, 3 vols. N.Y., Putnam. 1898–1900.
Bluntschli, J. K., *The Theory of the State*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1885.
Bodley, J. E. C., *France*, 2 vols. N.Y., Macmillan. 1898.
Bourinot, Sir J. G., *Canada under British Rule, 1760–1900* (Cambridge Historical Series). Cambridge, University Press. 1900.
Bourne, E. G., *Essays in Historical Criticism*. N.Y., Scribner. 1901.
Bourne, H. R. F., *Sir Philip Sidney* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1891.
Bowden, J. W., *Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh*, 2 vols. London, Rivingtons. 1840.
Bowker, A., *Alfred the Great*. London, Black. 1899.
Boyesen, H. H., *The Story of Norway* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1901.
Brandes, G., *Lord Beaconsfield*. Trans. by Sturge. N.Y., Scribner. 1880.
Brewer, J. S., *Reign of Henry VIII*, 2 vols. London, Murray. 1884.
Bright, J. F., *Maria Theresa* (Foreign Statesmen). London, Macmillan. 1897.
—— *Joseph II* (Foreign Statesmen). London, Macmillan. 1897.
Brooks, N., *The Story of Marco Polo*. N.Y., Century Co. 1898.
Bryce, J., *Impressions of South Africa*. N.Y., Century Co. 1897.
—— *The Holy Roman Empire*. New ed. N.Y., Macmillan. 1904.
—— *The Relations of the Advanced and the Backward Races of Mankind*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1902.
Buckle, H. T., *History of Civilization in England*, 2 vols. N.Y., Appleton. 1891.
Burckhardt, J., *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. N.Y., Macmillan. 1890.
Burr, G. L., *The Year 1000 and the Antecedents of the Crusades* (in *Am. Hist. Rev.* for April, 1901, vol. vi, No. 3).
Bury, J. B., *A History of the Later Roman Empire*, 2 vols. N.Y., Macmillan. 1889.
Busch, M., *Our Chancellor*. Trans. by Beatty-Kingston. N.Y., Scribner. 1884.
Caldecott, A., *English Colonization and Empire* (University Extension Manuals). N.Y., Scribner. 1891.
Cambridge Modern History, The (vol. i, "The Renaissance"; vol. ii, "The Reformation"; vol. iii, "The Wars of Religion"; vol. viii, "The French Revolution"). N.Y., Macmillan.
Carlyle, T., *Chartism*. In vol. iv of *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*, Centenary ed. London, Chapman. 1899.
—— *Heroes and Hero Worship*. N.Y., Cassell. 1904.
—— *History of Frederick the Second*. New ed., 5 vols. N.Y., Scribner. 1904.
—— *The French Revolution*. Ed. by J. H. Rose, 3 vols. N.Y., Macmillan. 1902.
Cesaresco, Martinengo (Countess), *The Liberation of Italy, 1815–1870*. N.Y., Scribner. 1894.

Chang Chih-Tung, *China's Only Hope.* N.Y., Revell. 1900.
Cheyney, E. P., *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1901.
—— *A Short History of England.* Boston, Ginn. 1904.
Church, R. W., *Saint Anselm.* London, Macmillan. 1895.
Cloete, H., *The History of the Great Boer Trek.* N.Y., Scribner, 1900.
Colquhoun, A. R., *China in Transformation.* N.Y., Harper. 1898.
—— *Russia against India; the Struggle for Asia.* N.Y., Harper. 1900.
—— *The Mastery of the Pacific.* New ed. N.Y., Macmillan. 1904.
Coman, K., and Kendall, E. K., *A History of England.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1899.
Compayré, G., *Abelard, and the Origin and Early History of Universities.* N.Y., Scribner. 1899.
Cornish, F. W., *Chivalry* (Social England Series). N.Y., Macmillan. 1901.
Coubertin, Baron Pierre de, *The Evolution of France under the Third Republic.* N.Y., Crowell. 1897.
Cox, G. W., *The Crusades* (Epochs). N.Y., Scribner.
Coxe, W., *History of the House of Austria* (Bohn), 4 vols. Vols. 1–3, 3d ed., 1847–1872; vol. 4, by W. K. Kelly. London, Macmillan.
Creasy, E. S., *Decisive Battles of the World.* New ed. N.Y., Harper. 1900.
—— *History of the Ottoman Turks.* New ed. London, Bentley. 1877.
Creighton, M., *Cardinal Wolsey* (Twelve English Statesmen). N.Y., Macmillan. 1898.
—— *History of the Papacy.* New ed., 6 vols. London, Longmans. 1899–1901.
—— *Queen Elizabeth.* London, Longmans. 1900.
Crowe, E. E., *History of the Reigns of Louis XVIII and Charles X,* 2 vols. London, Bentley. 1854.
Cunningham, W., *An Essay on Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects* (Cambridge Historical Series). Cambridge, University Press. 1900.
Curzon, G. N., *Problems of the Far East.* N.Y., Longmans, 1894.
—— *Russia in Central Asia in 1889 and the Anglo-Russian Question.* N.Y., Longmans. 1889.
Cutts, E. L., *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages.* New ed. N.Y., Pott. 1886.
Dabney, R. H., *The Causes of the French Revolution.* N.Y., Holt. 1888.
Davis, H. W. C., *Charlemagne* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1900.
Dicey, A. V., *England's Case against Home Rule.* N.Y., Scribner. 1886.
Dicey, E., *Victor Emmanuel* (Makers of History). N.Y., Caldwell.
Dickinson, G. L., *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France.* London, Allen, 1892.
—— *The Development of Parliament during the Nineteenth Century.* N.Y., Longmans. 1895.
Du Chaillu, P. B., *The Viking Age,* 2 vols. N.Y., Scribner. 1889.
Duffy, B., *The Tuscan Republics* (*Florence, Siena, Pisa, and Lucca*) *with Genoa* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1893.
Duruy, V., *A History of France.* N.Y., Crowell. 1889.
Edginton, T. B., *The Monroe Doctrine.* Boston, Little & Brown. 1904.
Egerton, H. E., *A Short History of British Colonial Policy.* London, Methuen. 1897.

Emerton, E., *An Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages.* Boston, Ginn. 1888.
—— *Desiderius Erasmus* (Heroes of the Reformation). N.Y., Putnam. 1900.
—— *Mediæval Europe.* Boston, Ginn. 1894.
Field, L. F., *An Introduction to the Study of the Renaissance.* N.Y., Scribner, 1898.
Figgis, J. N., *The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings* (Cambridge Historical Essays). Cambridge, University Press. 1896.
Fisher, G. P., *History of the Christian Church.* N.Y., Scribner. 1888.
—— *History of the Reformation.* N.Y., Scribner. 1884.
Fiske, J., *New France and New England.* New ed. Boston, Houghton. 1904.
—— *The Discovery of America*, 2 vols. Boston, Houghton. 1892.
—— *The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America.* New ed., 2 vols. Boston, Houghton, 1903.
—— *American Political Ideas.* New ed. N.Y., Harper. 1903.
Fletcher, C. R. L., *Gustavus Adolphus and the Struggle of Protestantism for Existence* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1901.
Forbes, A., *The Life of Napoleon the Third.* N.Y., Dodd. 1897.
Foster, J. W., *Arbitration and The Hague Court.* Boston, Houghton. 1904.
Fournier, A., *Napoleon the First.* N.Y., Holt. 1903.
Freeman, E. A., *Historical Essays.* 2d and 3d series. N.Y., Macmillan. 1873, 1880.
—— *History and Conquests of the Saracens.* Oxford, Henry & Parker. 1877.
—— *The Chief Periods of European History.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1886.
—— *A Short History of the Norman Conquest of England* (Clarendon Press Series). 3d ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1896.
—— *William the Conqueror* (Franklin Series). New ed. N.Y., Burt. 1903.
—— *Historical Geography of Europe.* New ed., 2 vols. N.Y., Longmans. 1903.
—— *The Ottoman Power in Europe.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1877.
Froude, J. A., *English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century.* N.Y., Scribner. 1895.
—— *Lectures on the Council of Trent.* London, Longmans. 1896.
—— *The Spanish Story of the Armada.* N.Y., Scribner. 1892.
Fyffe, C. A., *A History of Modern Europe, 1792–1878* (Popular Edition). N.Y., Holt. 1896.
Gairdner, J., and Spedding, J., *Studies in English History.* London, Hamilton. 1881.
Gallenga, A. C. N., *The Pope and the King; The War between Church and State in Italy*, 2 vols. London, Tinsley. 1879.
Galliene, Richard Le, *Old Love Stories retold.* N.Y., Baker & Taylor. 1904.
Gammage, R. G., *History of the Chartist Movement, 1837–54.* New ed. London, Truslove.
Gardiner, S. R., *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate.* New ed., 4 vols. N.Y., Longmans. 1903.
—— *History of the Great Civil War* (1642–1649). New ed., 4 vols. London, Longmans. 1893.
—— *History of England* (1603–1642), 10 vols. London, Longmans. 1863–1881.

Gardiner, S. R., *Oliver Cromwell.* London, Longmans. 1901.
—— *Student's History of England,* 3 vols. London, Longmans. 1890–1899.
—— *The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution* (Epochs). 14th impression. London, Longmans. 1899.
—— *The Thirty Years' War* (Epochs). N.Y., Scribner.
Gasquet, F. A., *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries,* 2 vols. 6th ed. London, Hodges. 1893–1895.
—— *The Great Pestilence, A.D. 1348–49.* London, Simpkin. 1893.
—— *The Old English Bible and Other Essays.* New ed. N.Y., Putnam. 1901.
—— *The Eve of the Reformation.* New ed. N.Y., Putnam. 1901.
Gibbon, E., *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* 7 vols. Ed. by J. B. Bury. London, Methuen. 1896–1900.
Gibbons, J. (Cardinal), *The Faith of our Fathers.* Balt., Murphy. 1888.
Gilman, A., *The Saracens from the Earliest Times to the Fall of Bagdad* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1898.
Gilman, D. C., *James Monroe* (American Statesmen). Boston, Houghton. 1892.
Gindely, A., *History of the Thirty Years' War,* 2 vols. Trans. by A. Ten Brook. N.Y., Putnam. 1884.
Goodyear, W. H., *Renaissance and Modern Art.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1900.
Gray, G. Z., *The Children's Crusade.* New ed. Boston, Houghton. 1900.
Green, J. R., *Short History of the English People.* Author's ed., new issue, 4 vols. N.Y., Wessels. 1902.
—— *The Conquest of England.* N.Y., Harper. 1883.
—— *History of the English People,* 4 vols. N.Y., Harper. 1878–1880.
Green, Mrs. J. R., *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century.* New ed., 2 vols. N.Y., Macmillan. 1904.
Green, W. D., *William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1901.
Grimm, H., *The Life of Michael Angelo,* 2 vols. 16th ed. Boston, Little & Brown. 1890.
Gross, C., *The Gild Merchant,* 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1890.
Guillemard, F. H. H., *The Life of Ferdinand Magellan* (The World's Great Explorers). N.Y., Dodd. 1891.
Guizot, F. P. G., *History of Civilization in Europe.* N.Y., Appleton. 1896.
Gummere, F. B., *Germanic Origins.* N.Y., Scribner. 1892.
Hadley, J., *Introduction to Roman Law.* N.Y., Appleton. 1873.
Hale, E., *The Fall of the Stuarts* (Epochs). N.Y., Scribner. 1901.
Hallam, H., *The Constitutional History of England.* N.Y., Harper. 1873.
Hannay, D., *Don Emilio Castelar* (Public Men of To-day). N.Y., Warne. 1896.
Hanotaux, G., *Contemporary France.* Trans. by Tarver. 4 vols. N.Y., Putnam. 1904.
Harrison, F., *Byzantine History in the Early Middle Ages.* London, Macmillan. 1900.
—— *Oliver Cromwell* (Twelve English Statesmen). N.Y., Macmillan. 1898.
—— *William the Silent* (Foreign Statesmen). N.Y., Macmillan. 1897.
Hart, A. B., *An Introduction to the Study of Federal Government* (Harvard Historical Monographs). Boston, Ginn. 1891.
Hassall, A., *Louis XIV and the Zenith of the French Monarchy* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1895.

Hassall, A., *The Balance of Power, 1715–1789* (Periods of European History). N.Y., Macmillan. 1896.
—— *The French People* (The Great Peoples Series). N.Y., Appleton. 1901.
Hatch, E., *The Organization of the Early Christian Church.* 5th ed. London, Longmans. 1895.
Häusser, L., *The Period of the Reformation.* New ed. N.Y., Carter. 1885.
Hazlitt, W. C., *The Venetian Republic*, 2 vols. London, Black. 1900.
Headlam, J. W., *Bismarck and the Founding of the German Empire* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1899.
Hellwald, F. von, *The Russians in Central Asia.* Trans. by Wirgman. London, H. S. King. 1874.
Henderson, E. F., *A Short History of Germany*, 2 vols. N.Y., Macmillan. 1902.
—— *History of Germany in the Middle Ages.* London, Bell. 1894.
Hill, G. B., *Colonel Gordon in Central Africa, 1874–1879.* New ed. London, De la Rue. 1883.
Hodgkin, T., *Charles the Great* (Foreign Statesmen). N.Y., Macmillan. 1897.
—— *Italy and Her Invaders*, 8 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1880–1899.
—— *Theodoric the Goth* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1900.
Hosie, A., *Manchuria, Its People, Resources, and Recent History.* London, Methuen. 1901.
Howorth, H. H., *History of the Mongols from the Ninth to the Nineteenth Century*, 3 parts. N.Y., Longmans. 1889.
Hughes, T., *Alfred the Great* (Franklin Series). N.Y., Burt. 1903.
—— *Livingstone* (Franklin Series). N.Y., Burt. 1903.
—— *Loyola and the Educational System of the Jesuits* (The Great Educators). N.Y., Scribner. 1901.
Hume, M. A. S., *Modern Spain* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1900.
—— *Philip II of Spain* (Foreign Statesmen). N.Y., Macmillan. 1897.
—— *Spain, its Greatness and Decay* (Cambridge Historical Series). 2d ed. Cambridge, University Press. 1899.
—— *The Spanish People* (The Great Peoples Series). N.Y., Appleton. 1901.
Ireland, A., *Tropical Colonization.* N.Y., Macmillan, 1899.
Irving, W., *Mahomet and his Successors* (Library of Illustrated Biographies). N.Y., Crowell. 1904.
—— *The Conquest of Granada* (Home Library). N.Y., Burt. 1900.
—— *Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus* (Library of Illustrated Biographies). N.Y., Crowell. 1904.
James, G. P. R., *History of Chivalry.* N.Y., Harper.
Janssen, J., *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages*, 6 vols. Trans. by Mitchell and Christie. London, Paul. 1896–1903.
Jenks, E., *History of the Australasian Colonies.* Cambridge, University Press. 1896.
—— *Parliamentary England: the Evolution of the Cabinet System.* N.Y., Putnam. 1903.
Jerrold, B., *The Life of Napoleon III*, 4 vols. London, Longmans. 1874–82.
Jessopp, A., *The Coming of the Friars.* London, Unwin. 1899.
Jewett, S. O., *The Story of the Normans* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1895.

Johnson, A. H., *The Normans in Europe* (Epochs). N.Y., Scribner. 1899.
Johnston, R. M., *Napoleon.* N.Y., Barnes. 1904.
Johnston, Sir H. H., *A History of the Colonization of Africa* (Cambridge Historical Series). Cambridge, University Press. 1899.
Judson, H. P., *Europe in the Nineteenth Century.* Meadville, Flood & Vincent. 1894.
Jusserand, J. J., *English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages.* N.Y., Putnam.
Kant, Immanuel, *Perpetual Peace.* Boston, American Peace Society. 1897.
Keane, J., *The Evolution of Geography.* London, Stanford. 1899.
Keary, C. F., *The Vikings in Western Christendom.* N.Y., Putnam. 1891.
Keltie, J. S., *The Partition of Africa.* 2d ed. London, Stanford. 1895.
Kennan, G., *Siberia and the Exile System,* 2 vols. N.Y., Century Co. 1891.
Kenyon, F. G., *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts.* 3d. ed. London, Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1898.
Kidd, B., *The Control of the Tropics.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1898.
King, B., *Mazzini* (The Temple Biographies). London, Dent. 1902.
King, D. B., *The Irish Question.* N.Y., Scribner. 1882.
Kinglake, A. W., *The Invasion of the Crimea,* 6 vols. New ed. N.Y., Harper. 1881–1888.
Kingsley, C., *The Hermits.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1890.
Kirk, J. F., *History of Charles the Bold,* 3 vols. Phila., Lippincott. 1864–68.
Kitchin, G. W., *A History of France,* 3 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1894–1899.
Köstlin, J., *Life of Luther.* N.Y., Scribner. 1900.
Krausse, A., *Russia in Asia.* N.Y., Holt. 1901.
Lacroix, P., *Military and Religious Life in the Middle Ages and at the Period of the Renaissance.* London, Bickers.
Lamartine, A., *History of the Girondists* (Bohn), 3 vols. London, Macmillan. 1892–1899.
Lane-Poole, S., *Saladin, and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam, 1898.
—— *Studies in a Mosque.* London, W. H. Allen. 1883.
—— *The Story of Turkey* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1891.
Lanfrey, P., *The History of Napoleon the First,* 4 vols. 2d ed. London, Macmillan. 1886.
Latimer, E. W., *Spain in the Nineteenth Century.* Chicago, McClurg. 1897.
Laurie, S. S., *The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities* (International Education Series). N.Y., Appleton. 1892.
Lea, H. C., *Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church.* Boston, Houghton. 1884.
—— *Superstition and Force.* 4th ed. Phila., Lea Brothers. 1892.
—— *The Moriscos of Spain: their Conversion and Expulsion.* Phila., Lea Brothers. 1901.
—— *A History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages,* 3 vols. N.Y., Harper. 1887–1888.
Lebon, A., *Modern France* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1901.
Lebon, A., and Pelet, P., *France as it is.* N.Y., Cassell. 1888.
Lecky, W. E. H., *History of England in the Eighteenth Century,* 7 vols. New ed. N.Y., Appleton. 1903.
—— *History of European Morals,* 2 vols. London, Longmans. 1877.
—— *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century,* 5 vols. New ed. N.Y., Appleton. 1893.
—— *The American Revolution.* Ed. by James Albert Woodburn. N.Y., Appleton. 1898.

Leger, L., *A History of Austro-Hungary*. London, Rivingtons. 1889.
Leroy-Beaulieu, A., *The Awakening of the East*. N.Y., McClure & Phillips. 1900.
—— *The Empire of the Tsars and the Russians*, 3 vols. Trans. by Ragozin. N.Y., Putnam. 1893–1896.
Lodge, R., *A History of Modern Europe* (The Student's Series). N.Y., Harper. 1899.
—— *Richelieu* (Foreign Statesmen). London, Macmillan. 1896.
—— *The Close of the Middle Ages* (Periods of European History). N.Y., Macmillan. 1901.
Longman, F. W., *Frederick the Great and the Seven Years' War* (Epochs). N.Y., Scribner.
Lowe, C., *Prince Bismarck*, 2 vols. Boston, Little & Brown. 1899.
—— *The German Emperor William II* (Public Men of To-day). N.Y., Warne. 1895.
Lowell, A. L., *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe*, 2 vols. Boston, Houghton. 1896, 1897.
Lowell, E. J., *The Eve of the Revolution*. Boston, Houghton. 1892.
Lowell, F. C., *Joan of Arc*. Boston, Houghton. 1896.
Lyall, Sir A., *The Rise of the British Dominion in India*. N.Y., Scribner. 1893.
McCarthy, J., *History of our own Times*. Author's ed., new issue, 2 vols. N.Y., Wessels. 1902.
—— *The Epoch of Reform* (Epochs). N.Y., Scribner. 1887.
McCarthy, J. H., *Ireland since the Union*. N.Y., Belford. 1887.
Macaulay, T. B., *Essays*, 3 vols. N.Y., Armstrong. 1893.
—— *The History of England from the Accession of James II*. New ed. 5 vols. N.Y., Crowell. 1904.
Macfadyen, D., *Alfred the West Saxon* (Saintly Lives). London, Dent. 1901.
Macy, J., *The English Constitution*. N.Y., Macmillan. 1897.
Mahan, A. T., *The Influence of Sea Power upon History*. 10th ed. Boston, Little & Brown. 1895.
—— *The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire*, 2 vols. 9th ed. Boston, Little & Brown. 1898.
—— *The Problem of Asia*. Boston, Little & Brown. 1900.
Malleson, G. B., *Life of Prince Metternich* (Statesmen Series). Phila., Lippincott. 1888.
Mallet, C. E., *The French Revolution* (University Extension Manuals). N.Y., Scribner. 1893.
Markham, C. R., *Life of Christopher Columbus* (World's Great Explorers). London, Philip. 1892.
Martin, H., *A Popular History of France*, 3 vols. Trans. by Booth and Alger. Boston, Estes & Lauriat. 1877.
—— *The Age of Louis XIV*, 2 vols. Trans. by Mary L. Booth. Boston, Walker, Wise & Co. 1865.
—— *The Decline of the French Monarchy*, 2 vols. Trans. by Mary L. Booth. Boston, Walker, Fuller & Co. 1866.
Mathews, S., *The French Revolution*. N.Y., Longmans. 1901.
May, T. E., *The Constitutional History of England*, 2 vols. N.Y., Armstrong. 1882.
Mazade, Charles de, *Life of Cavour*. N.Y., Putnam. 1877.
Mead, Mrs. L. A., *A Primer of the Peace Movement*. Boston, American Peace Society. 1904.

Michaud, J. F., *History of the Crusades*, 3 vols. New ed. N.Y., Armstrong. 1882.
Mignet, F. A., *History of the French Revolution.* Boston, Little & Brown. 1888.
Mijatovich, C., *Constantine, the Last Emperor of the Greeks; or the Conquest of Constantinople by the Turks (A.D. 1453).* London, Low. 1892.
Milner, A., *England in Egypt.* New ed. London, Arnold. 1894.
Mombert, J. I., *A History of Charles the Great.* N.Y., Appleton. 1888.
Montalembert, Count de, *The Monks of the West from St. Benedict to St. Bernard*, 6 vols. N.Y., Longmans. 1896.
Montgomery, D. H., *Leading Facts of English History.* Boston, Ginn. 1901.
Morfill, W. R., *The Story of Russia* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1890.
—— *The Story of Poland* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1893.
Morison, J. C., *The Life and Times of Saint Bernard.* London, Chapman & Hall. 1863.
Morley, J., *Oliver Cromwell.* N.Y., Century Co. 1900.
—— *The Life of Richard Cobden*, 2 vols. London, Unwin. 1896.
—— *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, 3 vols. N.Y., Macmillan. 1903.
—— *Walpole* (Twelve English Statesmen). London, Macmillan. 1899.
—— *Rousseau*, 2 vols. London, Macmillan. 1891.
—— *Voltaire.* London, Macmillan. 1893.
Morris, E. E., *The Age of Anne* (Epochs). N.Y., Scribner. 1877.
Morris, H. C., *The History of Colonization*, 2 vols. N.Y., Macmillan. 1900.
Morris, W. O., *The French Revolution and First Empire* (Epochs). N.Y., Scribner. 1886.
Moses, B., *The Establishment of Spanish Rule in America.* N.Y., Putnam. 1898.
Motley, J. L., *History of the United Netherlands*, 4 vols. New ed. N.Y., Harper. 1888.
—— *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, 3 vols. N.Y., Macmillan. 1904.
—— *Peter the Great* (Half Hour Series). N.Y., Harper.
Muir, W., *Annals of the Early Caliphate.* London, Smith & Elder. 1883.
—— *The Corân.* N.Y., E. & J. B. Young. 1879.
—— *The Life of Mahomet.* 3d ed. London, Smith & Elder. 1894.
—— *The Rise and Decline of Islam.* N. Y., Am. Tract Soc. 1884.
Müller, W., *Political History of Recent Times.* N.Y., Harper.
Mullinger, J. B., *The Schools of Charles the Great* (reprint). N.Y., Stechert. 1904.
—— *A History of the University of Cambridge* (Epochs of Church History). London, Longmans. 1888.
Munro, D. C., *A History of the Middle Ages.* N.Y., Appleton. 1902.
Munro, D. C., and Sellery, G. C., *Mediæval Civilization.* N.Y., Century Co. 1904.
Noble, E., *Russia and the Russians.* Boston, Houghton. 1900.
—— *The Russian Revolt.* Boston, Houghton. 1885.
Norman, H., *All the Russias.* N.Y., Scribner. 1902.
Okakura-Kakuzo, *The Awakening of Japan.* N.Y., Century Co. 1904.
Oliphant, Mrs., *The Makers of Florence.* N.Y., Burt. 1900.
—— *The Makers of Venice.* N.Y., Burt. 1900.

Oman, C., *The Byzantine Empire* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1898.
Overton, J. H., *The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century* (Epochs of Church History). London, Longmans. 1900.
Parkin, G. R., *Imperial Federation*. London, Macmillan. 1892.
Parkman, F., *Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV*. 24th ed. Boston, Little & Brown. 1891.
—— *Montcalm and Wolfe*, 2 vols. 17th ed. Boston, Little & Brown. 1891.
—— *Pioneers of France in the New World*. 25th ed. Boston, Little & Brown. 1891.
Pastor, L., *The History of the Popes*, 6 vols. London, K. Paul. 1898, 1899.
Pauli, R., *The Life of Alfred the Great*. London, Bell. 1900.
Payne, E. J., *History of European Colonies*. London, Macmillan. 1899.
—— *History of the New World called America*, 2 vols. N.Y., Macmillan. 1892–1899.
Pears, E., *The Fall of Constantinople*. N.Y., Harper. 1886.
Perkins, J. B., *France under Louis XV*, 2 vols. Boston, Houghton. 1897.
—— *France under Mazarin*, 2 vols. N.Y., Putnam. 1886.
—— *France under the Regency*. Boston, Houghton. 1892.
Phillips, W. A., *Modern Europe, 1815–1899* (Periods of European History). 2d ed. London, Rivingtons. 1902.
Pollard, A. F., *Henry VIII*. London, Joyant. 1902.
Poole, R. L., *Wycliffe and Movements for Reform* (Epochs of Church History). New ed. London, Longmans. 1896.
Prendergast, J. P., *The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland*. 2d ed. London, Longmans. 1870.
Prescott, W. H., *Conquest of Mexico* (Princeton Series). N.Y., Burt. 1904.
—— *Conquest of Peru* (Princeton Series). N.Y., Burt. 1904.
—— *History of the Reign of Philip the Second*, 3 vols. New ed. Phila., Lippincott. 1896.
—— *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella* (Princeton Series). N.Y., Burt. 1904.
Probyn, J. W., *Italy: from the Fall of Napoleon I, in 1815, to the Year 1890*. London, Cassell. 1891.
Putnam, G. H., *Books and their Makers during the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. N.Y., Putnam. 1897, 1898.
Putnam, R., *William the Silent*, 2 vols. N.Y., Putnam. 1895.
Rambaud, A., *History of Russia*, 3 vols. Trans. by Lang. Boston, Estes & Lauriat. 1879–1882.
Rashdall, H., *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. Oxford, Frowde. 1895.
Rawlinson, G., *The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*, 2 vols. N.Y., Dodd. 1882.
Reddaway, W. F., *The Monroe Doctrine*. N.Y., Macmillan. 1898.
—— *Frederick the Great and the Rise of Prussia* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1904.
Reinsch, P. S., *Colonial Government* (The Citizen's Library). N.Y., Macmillan. 1902.
—— *World Politics at the End of the Nineteenth Century as Influenced by the Oriental Situation*. N.Y., Macmillan. 1900.
Robertson, W., *History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles the Fifth*, 3 vols. New ed. Phila., Lippincott. 1881.

Robinson, J. H., *An Introduction to the History of Western Europe.* Boston, Ginn. 1903.
Robinson, A. M. F., *Margaret of Angoulême* (Famous Women Series). Boston, Little & Brown. 1887.
Rocheterie, Maxime De La, *The Life of Marie Antoinette*, 2 vols. N.Y., Dodd. 1893.
Roosevelt, T., *Life of Oliver Cromwell.* N.Y., Scribner. 1900.
Ropes, J. C., *The First Napoleon.* Boston, Houghton. 1893.
Rose, J. H., *The Life of Napoleon I*, 2 vols. N.Y., Macmillan. 1901.
—— *The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era* (Cambridge Historical Series). Cambridge, University Press. 1894.
Rosebery, Lord, *Napoleon, The Last Phase.* N.Y., Harper. 1901.
Sabatier, P., *Life of St. Francis of Assisi.* N.Y., Scribner. 1899.
Schuyler, E., *Peter the Great, Emperor of Russia*, 2 vols. N.Y., Scribner. 1884.
Schwill, F., *History of Modern Europe.* N.Y., Scribner. 1899.
Seebohm, F., *The English Village Community.* 4th ed. London, Longmans. 1890.
—— *The Era of the Protestant Revolution* (Epochs). 2d ed. N.Y., Scribner. 1901.
—— *The Oxford Reformers.* London, Longmans. 1896.
Seeley, J. R., *Life and Times of Stein*, 2 vols. Boston, Roberts Brothers. 1879.
—— *The Expansion of England.* Boston, Roberts Brothers. 1883.
—— *Napoleon the First.* Boston, Roberts Brothers. 1888.
Seignobos, C., *A Political History of Europe since 1814.* N.Y., Holt. 1900.
—— *The Feudal Régime.* N.Y., Holt. 1902.
Sergeant, L., *The Franks* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1898.
Shoemaker, M. M., *The Great Siberian Railway.* N.Y., Putnam. 1903.
—— *The Heart of the Orient.* N.Y., Putnam. 1904.
Sichel, W., *Disraeli : A Study in Personality and Ideas.* N.Y., Funk & Wagnalls. 1904.
Skrine, F. H., *The Expansion of Russia, 1815–1900.* 2d ed. Cambridge, University Press. 1904.
Sloane, W. M., *Life of Napoleon Bonaparte*, 4 vols. New ed. N.Y., Century Co. 1901.
—— *The French Revolution and Religious Reform.* N.Y., Scribner. 1901.
Smith, Goldwin, *Three English Statesmen.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1867.
Smith, H. P., *The Bible and Islam.* N.Y., Scribner. 1897.
Smith, J. H., *The Troubadours at Home*, 2 vols. N.Y., Putnam. 1899.
Smith, R. B., *Mohammed and Mohammedanism.* N.Y., Harper. 1875.
Southey, R., *The Life of Nelson* (Handy Classics). N.Y., Cassell. 1904.
—— *The Life of John Wesley* (Standard Biographies). N.Y., Stokes. 1903.
Spalding, M. J., *The History of the Protestant Reformation.* Many editions. Baltimore, Murphy & Co.
Sprenger, A., *The Life of Mohammed.* London, Williams & Norgate. 1851.
Stanley, A. P., *History of the Eastern Church.* New ed. N.Y., Scribner. 1884.
Stanley, H. M., *Through the Dark Continent*, 2 vols. N.Y., Harper. 1878.
Stephens, H. Morse, *A History of the French Revolution*, 3 vols. (only vols. i and ii have appeared). N.Y., Scribner. 1902.

Stephens, H. Morse, *Albuquerque* (Rulers of India Series). N.Y., Macmillan. 1892.
—— *Portugal* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1898.
—— *Revolutionary Europe, 1789–1815* (Periods of European History). 4th ed. London, Rivingtons. 1897.
—— *Syllabus of Lectures on Modern European History, 1600–1890*. N.Y., Macmillan. 1899.
Stephens, W. R. W., *Hildebrand and His Times* (Epochs of Church History). London, Longmans. 1898.
Stepniak (pseudonym), *The Russian Peasantry*. N.Y., Harper. 1888.
Stillé, C. J., *Studies in Mediæval History*. Phila., Lippincott. 1882.
Stillman, W. J., *The Union of Italy, 1815–1895* (Cambridge Historical Series). Cambridge, University Press. 1899.
Stirling, Maxwell W., *Don John of Austria*, 2 vols. London, Longmans. 1883.
—— *The Cloister Life of the Emperor Charles the Fifth*. N.Y., Scribner. 1890.
Storrs, R. S., *Bernard of Clairvaux*. N.Y., Scribner. 1893.
Stubbs, W., *The Constitutional History of England*, 3 vols. 3d ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1880.
Sumner, C., *Addresses on War*. Boston, Ginn. 1904.
Suttner, Bertha von, *Lay down your Arms*. 2d ed. London, Longmans. 1894.
Sybel, Heinrich von, *The History and Literature of the Crusades*. London, Chapman & Hall. 1861.
—— *History of Europe during the French Revolution*, 4 vols. London, Murray. 1867–1869.
—— *The Founding of the German Empire*, 7 vols. N.Y., Crowell. 1890–1898.
Symonds, J. A., *Renaissance in Italy*, 7 vols. New ed. N.Y., Scribner. 1897–1898.
—— *The Catholic Reaction* (in "Renaissance in Italy," Part V), 2 vols. N.Y., Scribner. 1898.
—— *The Age of the Despots* (in "Renaissance in Italy," Part I). N.Y., Scribner. 1897.
Taine, H. A., *The Ancient Régime*. N.Y., Holt. 1876.
—— *The French Revolution*, 3 vols. N.Y., Holt. 1885.
Tarbell, I. M., *Madame Roland* (Famous Women Series). N.Y., Scribner. 1896.
Taswell-Langmead, T. P., *English Constitutional History*. 4th ed. Boston, Houghton. 1890.
Taylor, H., *The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution*, 2 parts. Boston, Houghton. 1889.
Terry, B. S., *A History of England*. Chicago, Scott & Foresman. 1901.
Thatcher, O. J., and Schwill, F., *Europe in the Middle Ages*. N.Y., Scribner. 1896.
Thayer, W. R., *The Dawn of Italian Independence*, 2 vols. Boston, Houghton. 1899.
Thiers, L. A., *History of the Consulate and the Empire*, 12 vols. Phila., Lippincott. 1893–1894.
—— *The History of the French Revolution*, 5 vols. New ed. Phila., Lippincott. 1894.
Tocqueville, Alexis de, *The Old Régime and the Revolution*. N.Y., Harper. 1856.
Tolstoi, Leo, *War and Peace*. New trans. by Garnett, 3 vols. N.Y., McClure. 1904.

Tolstoi, Leo, *Bethink yourselves: a Letter on the Russo-Japanese War.* Chicago, Hammersmark. 1904.
Tout, T. F., *The Empire and the Papacy, 918–1273* (Periods of European History). London, Rivingtons. 1899.
Traill, H. D., *Social England*, 6 vols. N.Y., Putnam. 1891–1897.
Trevelyan, G. M., *England in the Age of Wycliffe.* 3d ed. London, Longmans. 1900.
Trueblood, B. F., *The Federation of the World.* Boston, Houghton. 1899.
Tuttle, H., *History of Prussia, 1134–1757*, 4 vols. Boston, Houghton. 1883–1896.
Two Centuries of Irish History, 1691–1870. By different writers. London, Paul. 1888.
Venturi, E. A., *Joseph Mazzini.* Ed. by P. A. Taylor. 2d ed. London, H. S. King. 1877.
Villari, P., *The Barbarian Invasion of Italy*, 2 vols. N.Y., Scribner. 1902.
Vincent, M. R., *The Age of Hildebrand* (Epochs of Church History). N.Y., Scribner. 1899.
Wakeman, H. O., *The Ascendancy of France, 1598–1715* (Periods of European History). N.Y., Macmillan. 1894.
—— *The Church and the Puritans* (Epochs of Church History). 5th ed. London, Longmans. 1897.
Wallace, D. M., *Russia.* N.Y., Holt. 1881.
Warner, G. T., *Landmarks in English Industrial History.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1898.
West, A. F., *Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools* (The Great Educators). N.Y., Scribner. 1899.
Whitcomb, M., *A History of Modern Europe.* N.Y., Appleton. 1903.
Wiel, A., *Venice* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1894.
Willert, P. F., *Mirabeau* (Foreign Statesmen). N.Y., Macmillan. 1898.
—— *Henry of Navarre* (Heroes of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1893.
Williams, H. N., *Madame de Pompadour.* N.Y., Scribner. 1902.
Wilson, W., *The State.* Boston, Heath. 1890.
Winsor, J., *Christopher Columbus.* Boston, Houghton. 1891.
—— *Narrative and Critical History of America*, 8 vols. Boston, Houghton. 1889.
Wishart, A. W., *A Short History of Monks and Monasteries.* Trenton, Brandt. 1900.
Young, A., *History of the Netherlands.* Boston, Estes & Lauriat. 1884.
Zimmer, H., *The Irish Element in Mediæval Culture.* N.Y., Putnam. 1891.
—— *The Hansa Towns* (Story of the Nations). N.Y., Putnam. 1895.

SOURCES

Adams, G. B., and Stephens, H. M., *Select Documents of English Constitutional History.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1901.
American History Leaflets. Ed. by Hart and Channing. N.Y., Lovell. 1892.
Anderson, F. M., *The Constitutions and other Select Documents Illustrative of the History of France, 1789–1901.* Minneapolis, Wilson. 1904.
Archer, T. A., *Crusade of Richard I* (English History by Contemporary Writers). N.Y., Putnam. 1889.
Aucassin and Nicolette. Trans. by Andrew Lang. N.Y., Crowell.
Bayeux Tapestry, The. Historic notes by Frank Rede Fowke. New ed. N.Y., Macmillan. 1898.

Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*. 5th ed. London, Bell. 1884.
Beust, Count von, *Memoirs*, 2 vols. London, Remington. 1887.
Bingham, Captain, *Journal of the Siege of Paris*. London, Smith & Elder. 1871.
Bismarck, The Man and the Statesman, 2 vols. Autobiography. Ed. by A. J. Butler. N.Y., Harper. 1899.
Boethius, *Consolation of Philosophy* (Temple Classics). N.Y., Macmillan. 1902.
Book of the Courtier, The. Trans. from the Italian of B. Castiglione by Hoby (The Tudor Translations). N.Y., Scribner. 1900.
Book of Ser Marco Polo, 2 vols. Trans. by Henry Yule. 2d ed. London, Murray. 1875.
Bourrienne, L. A. F. de, *Memoirs of Napoleon Bonaparte*. New ed. (Library of Standard Biographies). N.Y., Stokes. 1903.
Burke, E., *Reflections on the French Revolution*. N.Y., Macmillan. 1890.
Carlyle, T., *The Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*. Ed. by S. C. Lomas. N.Y., Putnam. 1904.
Cassiodorus, *Letters*. Trans. by Thomas Hodgkin. London, Frowde. 1886.
Cathay and the Road Thither (Hakluyt Society Publications), 2 vols. Ed. by Henry Yule. London. 1866.
Chronicles of the Crusades. London, Bell. 1900.
Clarkson, T., *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the Slave Trade by the British Parliament*, 2 vols. London, Longman & Hurst. 1808.
Colby, C. W., *Selections from the Sources of English History*. London, Longmans. 1899.
Dante, *De Monarchia*. Trans. by Aurelia Henry. Boston, Houghton. 1904.
—— *Divine Comedy, The*. Trans. by Norton, 3 vols. Rev. ed. Boston, Houghton. 1902.
Della Rocca, Count E., *The Autobiography of a Veteran, 1807–1893*. Trans. and ed. by J. Ross. N.Y., Macmillan. 1898.
DeWet, General C. R., *Three Years' War*. N.Y., Scribner. 1902.
Eginhard (Einhard), *Life of the Emperor Karl the Great*. Trans. by Glaister. London, Bell. 1877.
European Concert in the Eastern Question. Ed. by Thomas Erskine Holland. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1885.
Filmer, Sir R., *Patriarcha* (Morley's Universal Library). London, Routledge. 1887.
First Principles of the Reformation. Ed. by Wace and Buchheim. Phila., Lutheran Publication Society. 1885.
First Three English Books on America, The. Ed. by Edward Arber. Birmingham, Eng., 1 Montague Road. 1885.
Forbes, A., *My Experience of the War between France and Germany*, 2 vols. London, Hurst. 1871.
Ford, C., *The Life and Letters of Madame de Krüdener*. London, Black. 1893.
Froissart, Sir John, *Chronicles*. Ed. for boys by S. Lanier. N.Y., Scribner. 1884.
Hamley, E. B., *The Story of the Campaign*. Boston, Guild & Lincoln. 1855.
Heimskringla, The, or Chronicle of the Kings of Norway, 4 vols. Trans. by Samuel Laing. Rev. ed. N.Y., Scribner. 1889.
Henderson, E. F., *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*. London, Bell. 1892.
—— *Side Lights on English History*. N.Y., Holt. 1900.

Herberstein, Sigismund von, *Notes upon Russia.* Hakluyt Society Publications.
Hill, M., *Liberty Documents.* London, Longmans. 1901.
Historical Leaflets. Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Penn.
Historical Sources in Schools. Report to the New England History Teachers' Association by a select committee. N.Y., Macmillan. 1902.
Holls, F. W., *The Peace Conference at The Hague.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1900.
Jones, G., *Studies in European History* (Civilization in the Middle Ages). Chicago, Ainsworth. 1900.
Journal of Christopher Columbus, The. Ed. by C. R. Markham. Hakluyt Society Publications.
Kendall, E. K., *Source-Book of English History.* N.Y., Macmillan. 1900.
Koran [Qur'ân], 2 vols. Trans. by Palmer. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1880.
Krüger, Paul. *Memoirs.* N.Y., Century Co. 1902.
Law of Free Monarchies, by King James. In his *Works.* London, Montague. 1616.
Lee, G. C., *Source-Book of English History.* N.Y., Holt. 1900.
Mabie, H. W., *Norse Stories, retold from the Eddas.* N.Y., Dodd. 1901.
Mazzini, J., *Life and Writings*, 6 vols. New ed. London, Smith & Elder. 1890, 1891.
Metternich, Prince, *Memoirs*, 5 vols. Trans. by Mrs. Alexander Napier. N.Y., Scribner. 1880.
Milton, J., *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates.* In vol. ii of his prose works (Bohn). London, Macmillan. 1890–1901.
Mirror of Perfection, The. Ed. by Paul Sabatier. Boston, Page. 1900.
Moltke, Graf von, *The Franco-German War, 1870–1871.* Trans. by Bell and Fisher. N.Y., Harper. 1892.
More, Sir Thomas, *Utopia* (Morley's Universal Library). London, Routledge. 1889.
Old South Leaflets, 6 vols. Boston, Directors of the Old South Work, Old South Meeting House. 1896–1904.
Payne, E. J., *Voyages of the Elizabethan Seamen to America.* 2d ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1893.
Robinson, J. H., *Readings in European History*, 2 vols. Boston, Ginn. 1904. Our references to this work are uniformly to the first volume. The second volume has not yet (February, 1905) appeared.
Robinson, J. H., and Rolfe, H. W., *Petrarch.* N.Y., Putnam. 1898.
Saint-Simon, Duke of, *Memoirs*, 4 vols. Trans. by Bayle St. John. N.Y., Pott. 1901.
Sévigné, Madame de, *Letters* (selection). Chicago, McClurg. 1890.
Speeches and Table-Talk of the Prophet Mohammed. Trans. by Stanley Lane-Poole. London, Macmillan. 1882.
Stanley, H. M., *The Congo and the Founding of its Free State*, 2 vols. N.Y., Harper. 1885.
Story of Burnt Njal, The. Trans. by George W. Dasent. N.Y., Dutton. 1900.
Sully, Duke of, *Memoirs*, 4 vols. London, Bell. 1877.
Tarbell, I. M., *The Words of Napoleon* (Day's Work Series). Boston. 1900.
Translations and Reprints. Department of History of the University of Penn.
Whitcomb, M., *A Literary Source-Book of the Italian Renaissance.* Part I, The Italian Renaissance; Part II, The German Renaissance. Department of History of the University of Penn. 1900.
Wilhelmina, Frederica Sophia, *Memoirs*, 2 vols. Boston, Osgood. 1877.
Young, Arthur, *Travels in France.* London, Bell. 1890.

INDEX AND PRONOUNCING VOCABULARY

NOTE. — In the case of words whose correct pronunciation has not seemed to be clearly indicated by their accentuation and syllabication, the sounds of the letters have been denoted thus: ā, like *a* in *grāy;* ȃ, like *ā*, only less prolonged; ă, like *a* in *hăve;* ä, like *a* in *fär;* ạ, like *a* in *ạll;* ē, like *ee* in *meet;* ĕ, like *ē*, only less prolonged; ĕ, like *e* in *ĕnd;* ê, like *e* in *thêre;* ē, like *e* in *ērr;* ī, like *i* in *pīne;* ĭ, like *i* in *pĭn;* ō, like *o* in *nōte;* ŏ, like *ō*, only less prolonged; ŏ, like *o* in *nŏt;* ô, like *o* in *ôrb;* o͞o, like *oo* in *mo͞on;* ū, like *u* in *ūse;* ü, like the French *u;* c and ch, like *k;* ç, like *s;* g, like *g* in *get;* ġ, like *j;* ş, like *z;* ch, as in German *ach;* G, small capital, as in German *Hamburg;* ñ, like *ni* in *minion;* ṅ denotes the nasal sound in French, being similar to *ng* in *song.*

Aachen (ä′ken), 67.
Abbassides (ab-băs′ĭdz), dynasty of the, 55.
Ab′e-lärd, Peter, 193, 194.
Abu Bekr (ä′bo͞o bek′r), first caliph, 52 n. 6.
Abukir Bay (ä-bo͞o-kēr′), battle of, 540.
Ab-ys-sin′i-ä, 679 n. 19.
Acre (ä′ker), siege of, by crusaders, 135; by Bonaparte, 540.
Addison, Joseph, 483.
Ad-ri-an-ō′ple, Treaty of, 655.
Afghan War, first, 672; second, 672 n. 11.
Af-ghan-is-tän′, 672 n. 11.
Ä-frä-sĭ-äb′, Persian legendary hero, 167 n. 5.
Africa, Portuguese exploration of, 278; Stanley in, 667; partition of, 669; English in, 674–678; French in, 678, 679; Germans in, 681.
Africa, North, recovery of, by Justinian, 9; conquest of, by the Arabs, 52, 53.
Agincourt (ä′zhăn-ko͞or″), battle of, 212, 213.
Ä′grä, 162.
Aids, feudal, 83.
Aix-la-Chapelle (āks-lä-shä-pel′) (Ger. Aachen), Treaty of (1668), 407; (1748), 474.
Albert, archbishop of Mainz, 301.
Albert of Brandenburg, 307.
Albert, duke of Austria, 240.
Albert the Great, Schoolman, 194.
Albi (äl-bē′), 142 n. 11.
Al′bĭ-ġĕn″sēş, crusades against, 142, 143.
Al′boin, king of Lombards, 10 n. 5.
Albuquerque (äl-bo͞o-kēr′kĭ), 281 n. 3.
Alcuin (ăl′kwin), 67.
Aldine Press, at Venice, 264.
Al′dus Ma-nū′tĭ-us, 264.
Alembert, d' (a-lŏṅ-bär′), 507.
Alexander I, Tsar, at Tilsit, 558–560; at Erfurt, 565; war with Napoleon, 573–575; in Holy Alliance, 586; as liberal and as reactionist, 654; II, emancipates serfs, 657, 658; assassinated, 662; III, 662.
Alexius Com-nē′nus I, Greek emperor, asks aid of the Latins against the Turks, 130.
Alfred the Great, king of England, 74 n. 2.
Algeria, 678, 679.
Ali (ä′lē), caliph, 52 n. 6.
Almansur (äl-măn-so͞or′), caliph, 55.
Alphonso, king of Castile, emperor-elect H. R. E., 237.

Äl-säce′ (Ger. Elsass), ceded to France, 392; to Germany, 595; question of, in France, 596, 646, 647.
Ăl′vä, duke of, in Netherlands, 366, 367.
Amalfi (ä-mäl′fē), 103.
America, discovered by Northmen, 73.
Amiens (ä-mē-ăn′), Treaty of, 545, 546; broken, 553.
Amurath (ä-mōō-rät′) I, Turkish sultan, 165.
Anabaptists, 307 n. 10.
Anagni (ä-nän′yē), 154.
An-a-tō′li-a, 164.
An-a-tō′li-an Railway, 681.
Anchorites. See *Hermits*.
Anglo-Saxons, conquest of Britain, 12. See *England*.
An-gō′ra, battle of, 166.
Anjou (ŏn′zhōō), French province, 202.
Annates, 303 n. 5; Act of, 341.
Anne of Austria, 404.
Anne of Cleves, 345.
Anne, queen of England, 480–483.
Antioch, taken by crusaders, 132.
Antony of Bourbon, king of Navarre, 377.
Antwerp, Spanish fury at, 369.
Appeals, Act in Restraint of, 341.
A-quī′nas, Thomas, 194, 195.
Arabian Nights, 57.
Arabic system of notation, 58.
Arabs, origin and character, 46; religious condition before Mohammed, 46–48. See *Saracens* and *Moors*.
Aragon, union with Castile, 230.
Archæology, science of, created by classical revival, 272.
Architecture, mediæval, 183.
Är-co′lä, battle of, 538 n. 2.
Arkwright, 494 n. 19.
Är-mä′dä, Invincible, 356–359.
Arndt, 571.
Arthur, King, 12.
Arthur, Prince of Wales, 336.
Articles of Religion, Anglican, 348.
Artois (är-twä′), ceded to France, 404.
Äs′pern, battle of, 566.
Assassination, political, 341 n. 5.
"Assiento" (äs-ē-en′tō), the, 481.
Assignats (as′ig-nats; Fr. pron. ä-sē-ñä′), 518 n. 11.
Assisi (ä-sē′sē), 151.
Assizes of Jerusalem, 133.
Assuan (äs-swän′), 678.
As-trä-khän′, 454.
As-tu′rī-äs, the, 229.
Atahualpa (ä-tä-wäl′pä), 288.
Athanasius (ath-a-nā′shi-us), 23.
Athens, dukedom of, 137.
Attainder, bill of, 345 n. 5.
Attila, legend of, 29 n. 12.
Auerstädt (ou′ĕr-stĕt), battle of, 558.
Augsburg, Diet of, 308; Confession of, 308; Religious Peace of, 324; League of, 410, 411.
Au′gus-tīne, his mission to Britain, 16.
Augustus the Strong, 463.
Ausgleich (ous′glīch), 650.
Austerlitz (ous′ter-lits), battle of, 555.
Australasia, 671 n. 9.
Australia, 671; Commonwealth of, 671.
Austria (Ger. Œsterreich), House of, 238 n. 19; imperial crown becomes hereditary in, 240; under Charles V, 318; under Maria Theresa, 473–476; under Joseph II, 497–499; wars against French Revolution, 520, 537–539; wars against Napoleon, 545, 554, 555, 566, 576; empire of, 556; gains at Congress of Vienna, 583; in Holy Alliance, 586; Italian interests of, 619–629; German interests of, 634–642; in Austro-Hungarian monarchy, 650–653.
Austria-Hungary since 1866, 650–653.
Austrian Succession, War of, 472–474; England in, 486.
Austro-Prussian War, 641, 642.
Austro-Sardinian War, 626, 627.
Auto de fe (a′tō-dā-fā″), the, 232; at Valladolid, 365.
Ä′värs, subdued by Charlemagne, 63.
Avignon (ä′vēn′yŏn″), removal of papal seat to, 155.

Ā'von, river, 219.
Ā'zov, Russians capture, 458.
Aztecs, 287.

Bä'ber, founder of Mongol state in India, 162.
Bacon, Roger, 195, 196.
Bagdad, founded, 55.
Băj-a-zĕt' or Baj'a-zet I, 165, 166.
Bäl-bō'ä, Vasco de, 286 n. 11.
Baldwin of Flanders, Latin emperor of the East, 137.
Balliol (băl'ĭ-ol), John, Scottish king, 206, 207.
Ban'nock-burn", battle of, 208.
Bär-bă-rŏss'ä, bey of Algiers, 322 n. 5.
Barebone, Praise-God, 437.
Bär'ne-veld, John of, 374 n. 8.
Barras (bä-räs'), 536 n. 25.
Bä'sel, Church Council of, 157.
Bä'sel (Fr. Bâle), treaties of, 537 n. 26.
Bastille (băs-tēl'), storming of the, 515.
Batavian Republic (this had been created in 1795), made into kingdom of Holland, 552.
Batu (bä'tōō"), Mongol leader, 161, 162.
Bautzen (bout'sen), battle of, 576.
Bavaria (Ger. Bayern), kingdom, 556; in German Empire, 646.
Bay'ard (Fr. pron. bä-yär'), Chevalier, 321.
Baylen (bī-len'), capitulation of, 564 n. 21.
Bä-zaine', Marshal, 595.
Becket. See *Thomas Becket.*
Bede (bēd), the Venerable, 20 n. 5.
Bedouins (bĕd'ōō-ēnz), the, 46.
"Beggars," origin of name, 365; "water beggars," 369.
Begging friars. See *Mendicant friars.*
Belgium (Fr. Belgique), war of Louis XIV concerning, 407; ceded to Austria, 413; revolution in, 498; ceded to France, 538; in kingdom of Netherlands, 583; independent kingdom, 591.
Bel-ĭ-sā'rĭ-us, general, 9.
Bel-ler'o-phon, the, 578.
Benares (be-nä'rez), 122.
Ben'der Ab'bäs, 683.
Benedetti (bā-nā-det'tē), 644.
Benedictines, order of the, 25.
Ben'e-fic"ĭ-um, the, 80.
Benevolences, 335.
Beowulf (bā'ō-wulf), Saxon poem, 19.
Beresina (bêr-ĕ-zē'nä), 575.
Bĕr'gen, 174.
Ber-lin' (Ger. pron. bêr-lēn'), Decree, 561; Treaty of, 660.
Bernadotte (bér'na-dot), king of Sweden, 583 n. 3.
Bes-sa-rā'bi-a, ceded to Russia, 660.
Beust (boist), Count, 650.
Bible, Luther's, 306; King James', 424.
Bishops' War, 427, 428.
Bis'marck, Otto von, 639–649.
Black Death, the, 210; effect on wages in England, 211.
Black Hole of Calcutta, 490 n. 14.
Black Prince, the, 211.
Blenheim (blen'im), battle of, 412.
"Bloody Assizes," the, 447 n. 16.
Blüch'er, 578.
Blues and Greens, factions at Constantinople, 43.
Boccaccio (bok-kät'chō), his *Decameron*, 259; as a humanist, 259.
Boers (bōōrs), the, 674–676.
Bō-ē'thĭ-us, 8.
Bohemia, in Thirty Years' War, 387, 388.
Bō'hē-mond, prince of Otranto, 132.
Boleyn, Anne (bōōl'in), 339, 341; marriage, 341; death, 345.
Bolingbroke (bol'ing-brōōk), 505 n. 5.
Bologna (bō-lōn'yä), University of, 188.
Bonaparte. See *Jerome, Joseph, Louis, Napoleon.*
Boniface (bŏn'e-făss) VIII proclaims jubilee, 300.
Bō'rä, Catherine von, 304 n. 6.
Bordeaux (bor-dō'), 533.
Borodino (bor-ō-dē'nō), battle of, 574.
Borromeo (bor-rō-mā'ō), Carlo, 311.
Bo-rus'si, the, 469.
Bos'ni-ä, revolt in, 659; administered by Austria-Hungary, 660.
Bos'pō-rus, the, 53.
Bossuet (bo-sü-ā'), 398, 417 n. 14
Bosworth Field, battle of, 215.

Botany Bay, 671.
Boulogne (bōō-lōn′), camp of, 554.
Bour′bon, Cardinal, 381.
Bourbon, House of, accession in France, 381; in Spain, 411; restored in France, 576; in Naples, 582; heirs expelled from France, 597; in Spain, 614.
Bourgeoisie (bōōr-zhwä-zē′), 503.
Boyne, battle of the, 452.
Braddock, 489 n. 11.
Bradshaw, 443.
Brä-gän′zä, House of, in Portugal, 563.
Brandenburg, electorate of, under the Hohenzollerns, 469.
Brant, Sebastian, 297 n. 1.
Brazil, falls to Portugal, 281 n. 5; Portuguese royal family flee to, 615 n. 2; empire of, 615 n. 2; republic of, 615 n. 2.
Breitenfeld (brī′ten-felt), battle of, 390.
Brethren of the Common Life, 297.
Bretigny (bre-tēn-yī′), Treaty of, 211 n. 9.
Briel (brēl), 368, 369.
Bright, John, 602 n. 1.
Britain, Anglo-Saxon conquest of, 12. See *England*.
British Empire in India, 672, 673.
Brittany, origin of name, 12 n. 6.
Bruce, Robert, king of Scotland, 207, 208.
Brū′ğĕş (Fr. pron. brüzh), 174.
Bru-maire′, Revolution of, 540, 541.
Brunelleschi (brōō-nĕl-lĕs′kē), 267 n. 10.
Brunswick, Duke of, 521; House of, 484 n. 5.
Budapest, 650.
Bulgaria, 660 n. 8.
Bunyan, John, 443.
Burghley, Lord, 352.
Burgundians, kingdom of the, 9.
Bur′gun-dy, origin of name, 9.
Butler, Samuel, 450.
Byron, Lord, 654 n. 1.
Byzantine Empire. See *Eastern Empire*.

Cabinet, English, 485.
Cab′ot, John, 337.
Cabot, Sebastian, 337.
Cā′diz, 359.
Cæd′mon, poet-monk, 20.
Caen (koṅ), 526.
Cahiers (kä-yā′), 510.
Cairo, 58; Bonaparte in, 399.
Caj′e-tan, Cardinal, 303 n. 4.
Calais (kăl′iss), captured by English, 210; English lose, 351.
Calcutta, Black Hole of, 490 n. 14.
Calendar, French Revolutionary, 529.
Caliphate of Bagdad, established, 55; Golden Age of, 55; dismemberment of, 55, 56.
Calmar, Union of, 249.
Calvin, John, at Geneva, 309 n. 13; burns Servetus, 312.
Calvinists, 309; omitted from Peace of Augsburg, 324 n. 7.
Cam-ba-lu′, Mongol capital, 162.
Cam-bō′dĭ-ä, 679.
Cambronne (koṅ-bron′), 578 n. 30.
Campagna (käm-pän′yä), 632.
Campo Formio (käm-pō-for′mē-ō), Treaty of, 538.
Canada, under Louis XIV, 413, 414; ceded to England, 419; Dominion of, 670.
Cä-nŏs′sä, Henry IV's humiliation at, 118.
Can-tā′bri-a, 229.
Ca-nūte′, king of England, 75.
Cape Colony, 674.
Cā′pet, Hugh, king of France, 220, 221.
Capetians. See *France*.
Cape-to-Cairo Railway, 676.
Capitularies of Charlemagne, 66.
Cär-bō-nā′ri, 620.
Cardinals, Sacred College of, 113 n. 4.
Carloman, king of Franks, 62.
Cärl′städt, 306.
Cär-när′von, castle, 205, 206.
Carnegie (car-nā′gie), Andrew, 701.
Cär-nī-ō′lä, 566.
Carnot (kär-nō′), Sadi, 596 n. 10.
Car-o-lin′gi-an family, beginning of, 62; its extinction, 69.
Carrier (kär-yā′), 534.
Carroccio (cär-rŏt′chō), the, 177 n. 3.
Cartwright, 494.
Casimir-Périer (käz-ĭ-mēr′ pā-ryā′), 596 n. 10.

Cas'sĭ-o-dō"rus, Theodoric's minister, 8 n. 2.
Castelar (käs-tā-lär'), Emilio, 618.
Castiglione (käs-tēl-yō'ne), 538 n. 27.
Castile (kas-tēl'), the name, 230; union with Aragon, 238.
Castles, feudal, 88.
Cateau Cambresis (kä-tō' koṅ-brā-zē'), Peace of, 328.
Cathedral building, 185.
Catherine of Aragon, 339, 340, 341.
Catherine II the Great, reign, 466–468.
Catherine de' Medici (de mā'dē-chē), 377, 379.
Catholic Emancipation Act, 607.
Catholic League, in France, 381; in Germany, 387.
Catholic Reaction, 308–314.
Cavaliers, 430.
Cavour (kä-vōōr'), Count, 625, 626, 627, 628.
Cawn-pur', 673 n. 13.
Caxton, William, 219.
Cecil, Robert, 353.
Cecil, William. See *Burghley*.
Celibacy of the clergy, 115.
Celtic Church, 18, 19.
Celts, at opening of the Middle Ages, 6; Christianity among, 17–19; conversion of Irish Celts by St. Patrick, 17.
Cenis (sĕ-nē'), Mount, tunnel, 626.
Cerdagne (sĕr'dāñ"), 225.
Cēr-văn'tēṣ, 99.
Chambers of Reunion, 409 n. 8.
Champlain (sham-plān'), 383.
Charlemagne (shär'le-mān), king of Franks, 62–68; his wars, 62, 63; restores the Empire in the West, 64, 65; as a ruler, 65–67; his Palace School, 67; his death, 67; results of his reign, 68; division of his dominions, 68.
Charles Albert, king of Sardinia, 623, 624.
Charles the Bald, king of the Western Franks, 80.
Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy, 225.
Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine, 377.
Charles Felix, king of Sardinia, 621.
Charles Martel, at battle of Tours, 54; creates a cavalry force, 86.
Charles the Simple, king of the Western Franks, 75.
Charles I, king of England, reign, 425–434; II, reign, 443–446.
Charles IV, king of France, 209; VI, 212; VII, 213, 214; VIII, 225–227; IX, king of France, 377, 379, 381; X, 590.
Charles IV, Emperor H. R. E., 237 n. 18; V, commissions Magellan, 282; at Diet of Worms, 304, 305; of Augsburg, 308; narrative of reign, 318–325; his abdication, 325, 326; VI, 412, 472; VII, 473 n. 1.
Charles II, king of Spain, 411; IV, 564.
Charles XII, king of Sweden, 462, 463, 464 n. 6.
Chartism, 603.
Chatham. See *Pitt*.
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 217.
Chev'i-ot (or chiv'i-ot) Hills, 338 n. 3.
Chil'de-ric, last Merovingian king, 62.
Children's Crusade, the, 138–140.
China, question of partition of, 687; war with Japan, 688–690; dismemberment of, 690; Boxer uprising, 690; republic of, 691–693.
Chivalry, origin of, 93, 94; its universality, 94; training of the knight, 95; ceremony of knighting, 95, 96; the tournament, 96, 97; character of the knight, 97, 98; decline of the system; 98; evil and good in system, 99.
Chos'ro-eṣ II, king of Persia, 44.
Christian IV, king of Denmark, 388; IX, 640.
Christianity, as factor in mediæval history, 4; introduced among the Teutonic tribes, 14–21; progress of, before the fall of Rome, 15; introduced into Russia, 21; reacted upon by paganism, 22; in French Revolution, abolished, 530.
Chronicle, Anglo-Saxon, 74 n. 2.
Chrys-ō-lō'ras, Manuel, Greek scholar, 260.
Church, early constitution of, 27; separation of the Eastern from

the Western or Latin Church, 32; growth of a martial spirit in, 123, 124. See *Papacy*.
Church Councils: Council of Nicæa, 15; of Pisa, 156; of Constance, 156; of Basel, 157; of Trent, 310, 311.
Church property, in France, nationalized, 518.
Cid, poem of the, 233.
Cimabue (chē-mä-boo′ā), 268 n. 14.
Cisalpine Republic, first, 538, 541; second, 545, 552.
Civil Code, 549.
Civil Constitution of Clergy, in French Revolution, 518; terminated, 547.
Civil War (1642–1649), in England, 430–434.
Clarendon, Constitutions of, 200.
Clermont (kler-môn′), Council of, 130.
Clive, Robert, 490.
Clo′vis, king of the Franks, 10; his conversion, 15.
Cluniac revival, 122, 126.
Cluny (klü-nē′), monastery of, 26; center of reform, 26, 114.
Clyde, river, 483.
Cobden, Richard, 602 n. 1.
Codes: Justinian Code, 43; Assizes of Jerusalem, 133; Code Napoléon, 549.
Colbert (kōl-bēr′), 406.
Col′et, John, 295.
Coligny, Gaspard de (ko-lēn-yē′), 377, 378, 379, 380.
Colonization, European, 664–667. See national titles such as *English Colonies*.
Colonnas, Giovanni, 259.
Columbus, Christopher, importance of his achievement, 275; voyages of, 279, 280.
Comitatus, the, 81.
Commendation, Gallic custom, 81.
Commons, English House of, origin, 203–205. See *Parliament, English*.
Commonwealth of England, 434–438.
Commune, Revolutionary, of Paris, 514.
Communists, Paris, 595.
Compass, invention of, 277 n. 2.
Concordat, French, of 1801, 547.
Condottieri (kŏn′dŏt-tyā″rē), 179.
Confederation of the Rhine, 556.
Congo Free State, 668 n. 5.
Conrad III, Emperor H. R. E., 134.
Constance, Church Council of, 156; Peace of (1183), 177.
Con′stan-tīne VI, Eastern emperor, 64.
Constantine, Palæologus, last emperor of the East, 166.
Constantinople, besieged by Saracens, 53; captured by crusaders, 136–138; by Ottoman Turks, 166.
Constituent Assembly, French, 513–519.
Constitutions: Austria (1849), 638; (1867), 651; England, 437; France (1791), 519; (1795), 535; (1799), 543; (1814), 577; (1848), 592; (1851), 593; (1875), 596; Hungary (1867), 651; Norway (1814), 584; Netherlands (1814), 584; Poland (1815), 655; Portugal (1820), 615 n. 2; Prussia (1850), 638; Sardinia (1848), 623; Spain (1812), 614; (1837), 618; (1875), 618; Switzerland (1815), 584; Two Sicilies (1820), 620.
Consulate, French, 543–551.
Continental Blockade, 560–562.
Conventicle Act, 443.
Convention, French National, 523–536.
Conway, castle, 206.
Cook, James, Captain, 671.
Copenhagen bombarded, 563.
Co-per′ni-cus, Nicholas, 276 n. 1.
Cor-day′, Charlotte, 526.
Cordeliers (Eng. pron. kôr′de-lērs″), Club, 519.
Cor′dō-vä, 54.
Corn Laws repealed, 602 n. 1.
Corneille (kor-nāy′), 417.
Cor-ō-man′del, 474.
Corporation Act repealed, 606.
Cor′pus Ju′ris Ci-vi′lis, 43.
Correggio (kor-rĕd′jō), 268 n. 14.
Corsica, ceded to France, 419.
Cortes (kôr′tĕs), Spanish, 186 n. 14.
Cortes (Span. pron. kor-tās′), Hernando, 286.
Cō-rŭn′nä, battle of, 566 n. 23.
Coster of Haarlem, 263 n. 8.

Coulanges (kö-lonzh′), Fustel de, 187.
Council, of Blood, 367; of the North, 426 n. 6; of Trent, 310, 311; Vatican, 630 n. 5.
Counter-Reform, Catholic, 310, 311.
Coup d'État (kōō-dā-tä′), of Brumaire, 540, 541; of December 2, 1851, 593.
Court of Arbitration, International, 701.
Covenanters, 428; persecution of, 444.
Cranmer, Thomas, 340, 341; death, 350.
Crécy (krĕs′se), battle of, 209.
Crespy (krā-pē′), Peace of, 322.
Crimea, Russia conquers, 466; war in, 656, 657.
Crompton, 494 n. 19.
Cromwell, Oliver, parliamentary general, 431–436; seizes government, 437; Protector, 438–440; death, 440; treatment of body, 443.
Cromwell, Richard, 440.
Cromwell, Thomas, 340, 341; death, 345 n. 5.
Crusades, enumerated, 121; causes of, 122–127; circumstances favoring, 127–129; legend of Peter the Hermit, 129; Councils of Piacenza and Clermont, 130; narrative of the Crusades in the East, 131–140; Crusades in Europe, 141–143; their results for European civilization, 143–146. See *Table of Contents*.
Cul-lō′den Moor, battle of, 487.
Curfew, the, 107.
Customs Union, German, 637.
Cuzco (kōōz′kō), 288.
Cyprus, ceded to England, 660.
Czechs (chechs or cheks), 652.

Danelagh (dān′la), the, 72.
Danes. See *Scandinavians*.
Dante, Alighieri (ä-lē-ge-ä′rē), precursor of the Renaissance, 253, 254; his *Commedia*, 254.
Dăn′ton (Fr. pron. doṅ-tôṅ′), in Convention, 523: on first Committee of Public Safety, 525; death, 531.
Dā′ri-en, Isthmus of, Scotch colony at, 482.
Dark Ages, the, character of, 1, 2.
Darnley, Henry Stuart, Lord, 355.
Declaration, of Indulgence, 447; of Rights, 448; of the Rights of Man, 516.
Defoe, Daniel, 483.
Delhi (del′lē), 162
Demarcation, Papal Line of, 281, 282.
Denmark, in Thirty Years' War, 388; Continental Blockade, 562; loses Norway, 583 n. 3; Schleswig-Holstein War, 640, 641. See *Calmar, Union of*.
Derby, Earl of, 604.
Descartes (dā-kärt′), 417 n. 14.
Des-ĭ-de′rĭ-us, king of the Lombards, deposed by Charlemagne, 63.
Despots, Italian, 178, 179.
Diane de Poitiers (dĭ-än′ de pwätyā′), 376.
Dias (dē′äs), Bartholomew, 278.
Diderot (dē-drō′), 507.
Directory, French, 535–541.
Disestablishment, in Ireland, 607–609; proposed in England and Scotland, 609.
Disraeli (diz-rā′li), 608.
Distribution of wealth in the United States, 707 n. 4.
Divina Commedia (dē-vē′nä kommā′dē-ä), 254.
Divine Right of Kings, the theory, 396–398; its history, 398, 399; opinion of James I on, 420; of Louis XIV, 403.
Doge (dōj), the name, 179.
Domesday Book (dōomz″dā′), 106.
Dominicans, order of the, 151.
Don Quixote (Sp. pron. dōn kēhō′te), 99.
Dŏn-ä-tĕl′lō, 267 n. 10.
Donation of Constantine, 32 n. 15; its unhistorical character shown by Valla, 273.
Dragonnades (drag-o-nādz′), 409.
Drake, Francis, 357, 359.
Dreibund (drī′bo͝ont), 648.
Dreyfus (drī′fus), Alfred, 598 n. 11.
Drogheda (droch′e-dä), 435.
Duma, Russian, 663.
Dunbar, battle of, 436.
Dunkirk, 439.
Duns Scotus, 195.

Duquesne (dü-kān′), Fort, 489.
Dutch. See *Netherlands*.
Dutch colonies, 444; at the Cape, 674, 675; in East Indies, 331, 674 n. 14.

East India Company, English, 423, 673.
Eastern Empire, sketch of history, 42–45; becomes Greek, 44, 45; services of, to European civilization, 45; effects upon, of Crusades, 143.
Eastern Rumelia (rōō-mē′liä), 660 n. 8.
Ebro (ā′brō), river, 564.
Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 200 n. 2.
Ecclesiastical Reservation, 324; violated, 387.
Eck, John, 303 n. 4.
Edda, the, 73 n. 1.
E-des′sa, 134.
Edgehill, battle of, 431 n. 10.
Edict, of Nantes, 382; revoked, 409, 410; of Grace, 385; of restitution, 388; of Toleration in Austria, 497; of Emancipation in Prussia, 572; in Russia, 657, 658.
Education, English acts, 602 n. 1, 604; question in France, 597.
Education, reformed by the New Learning, 271.
Edward, the Confessor, king of England, 75; his death, 103; I, 205–208; II, 208; III, 208, 209, 210, 211; VI, birth, 345; reign, 347–349.
Eg′bert, king of Wessex, 12.
Egmont, 366.
Egypt, conquest of, by Saracens, 52; England in, 676–678.
Einhard (īn′härd), secretary of Charlemagne, 66.
Elba, 576.
Elbe (ĕlb; Ger. pron. ĕl′be), river, 392.
Electors, the Seven, of Germany. 236, 237.
Elizabeth, queen of England, reign, 351–361.
Elizabeth, tsaritsa, 475.
Emigrés (ā-mē-grā′), French, 516; return of, 547.
Encyclopedists, 507.
Enghien (oṅ-giaṅ′), duke of, 550.
England, origin of name, 12; Anglo-Saxon conquest of, 12; Christianity in, 16; results of conversion of Anglo-Saxons, 16; reign of Alfred the Great, 74 n. 2; Danish conquest, 75; Saxon line restored, 75; Norman conquest and rule, 103–109; under the houses of Plantagenet, Lancaster, and York, 199–216; loss of possessions in France, 201; conquest of Wales, 205, 206; wars with Scotland, 206–208; Hundred Years' War, 208–215; Wars of the Roses, 215, 216; under the Tudors, 334–361; in seventeenth century, 420–453; in eighteenth century, 480–496; since Waterloo, 599–613. See *Table of Contents*.
English colonies, the Cabots, 337; under Elizabeth, 359, 360; under James I, 423; under Anne, 482; in Seven Years' War, 488–491; in American Revolution, 491, 492; slavery abolished in, 493; at close of nineteenth century, 669–678.
Enlightened despotism, theory of, 400–402; exemplified by Catherine II, 466; by Frederick II, 477, 478; by Joseph II, 497–499; by Napoleon, 547–549.
Equality, principle of, 580.
E-ras′mus, Desiderius, 295, 296.
Er′furt, Congress of, 565.
E-rig′e-nä, John Scotus, 192.
Eritrea (ā-rē-trā′ä), 679 n. 19.
Ertogrul (er′tō-grōōl), Ottoman chieftain, 164, 165.
Eschenbach (esh′en-bäch), Wolfram of, 241 n. 22.
Es-co′ri-al, the, 328 n. 10.
Essenes (ĕs-sēnz′), the, 23 n. 6.
Essex, second earl of, 360 n. 8; third earl of, 431.
Essling, battle of, 566.
Estates-General. See *States-General*.
E-tru′ri-ä, kingdom of, 546.
Ettenheim, 550.
Eugene of Savoy, Prince, 412.
Eugenie (ē-zhā-nē′), Empress, 594.
Ev′e-lyn, John, 459 n. 3.
Excommunication, effects of, 117.
Eylau (ī′lou), battle of, 558.

Fa-bi'o-la, 27 n. 11.
Factory Act, English, 602 n. 1.
Fairfax, Sir Thomas, 432.
False Decretals, the, 32 n. 15.
Faure (fōr), Félix, 596 n. 10.
Faust, printer, 264.
Faustus, legend of, 270 n. 15.
Fawkes, Guy, 421.
Federalism, 697–700.
Fénelon (fān-lôṅ'), 417 n. 14.
Ferdinand of Aragon, marriage to Isabella of Castile, 230; sets up the Inquisition, 232; his death, 232.
Ferdinand I, Emperor of Austria, 638.
Ferdinand II, Emperor H.R.E., 388.
Ferdinand VII, king of Spain, accession, 614; reign, 616.
Ferdinand IV, king of Naples, as Ferdinand I, king of the Two Sicilies, 620.
Feudalism, defined, 77; subinfeudation, 77; origin of fiefs, 80; origin of feudal patronage, 81; origin of feudal sovereignty, 81, 82; ceremony of homage, 82; relation of lord and vassal, — reliefs, fines, aids, etc., 83; manorial serfs, 84–86; development of the feudal system, 86–88; castles of the nobles, 88, 89; sports of the nobles, 89; causes of decay, 89–91; extinction of, in different countries, 90 n. 7; defects of the system, 91; good results of the system, 92, 93; effects upon, of Crusades, 145.
Feuillants (fē-yoṅ'), 520.
Fich'te, 571.
Field of Cloth of Gold, 321 n. 3.
Filmer, quoted, 397, 398.
Fine arts, revival of the, 266–269.
Finland, Russia conquers, 559, 565; Russianization of, 662, 663.
Finns, the, 22.
Fire-worshipers, 53 n. 7.
Fisher, John, bishop of Rochester, 342.
Five Mile Act, 444.
Flag'el-lants, the, 210 n. 8.
Flodden Field, battle of, 338 n. 3.
Florence, sketch of history, 182, 183.
Forest laws of the Normans, 108.
For-mo'sa, 689.
Fra An-gel'i-co, 268 n. 14.
France, beginnings of French kingdom, 220; the Capetian period, 220–224; table of Capetian kings (direct line), 220 n. 11; in the Crusades, 222; effects upon, of the Hundred Years' War, 224; under the mediæval Valois, 224–227; wars with Charles V, 320–323; under the later Valois kings, 376–381; under Henry IV, 381–384; under Louis XIII, 384–386; gains in Treaty of Westphalia, 392; under Louis XIV, 403–417; Louis XV, 417–419; condition in eighteenth century, 500–509; under Louis XVI, 509–524; the Revolution, 524–542; the Consulate, 543–551; the Empire, 551–576; since Waterloo, 589–598.
Franche-Comté (froṅsh-kôṅ-tā'), 408.
Francis I, Emperor H.R.E., 473 n. 1; II, makes Treaty of Campo Formio, 538; of Lunéville, 545; as Francis I, Emperor of Austria, 556.
Francis I, king of France, rival of Charles V, 320, 321; wars with Charles V, 321–323; persecution of Waldenses, 323; II, reign of, 376, 377.
Francis II, king of Two Sicilies, 627.
Francis Joseph, Emperor of Austria, accession, 638; makes Peace of Villafranca, 627; of Prague, 642; grants reforms to Hungary, 650; popularity of, 652.
Franciscans, order of the, 151, 152.
Franco-Prussian War, 594–596, 643–646.
Frankfort (Ger. Frankfurt); Constituent Assembly at, 639 n. 4; annexed to Prussia, 642.
Franks, the, under the Merovingians, 9, 10; their conversion, 15; importance of conversion, 15.
Frederick I, Barbarossa, Emperor H. R. E., in Third Crusade, 135; quarrel with Pope Alexander III, 149; his struggle with the Lombard League, 176, 177; represents German nationality, 235; II, relations to the Papacy, 152, 153.

Frederick IV, king of Denmark, 463; VII, 640.
Frederick (III) I, king of Prussia, 470; II, the Great, 472–479; in partition of Poland, 476.
Frederick V, Elector Palatine, king of Bohemia, 388 n. 2.
Frederick the Wise, elector of Saxony, 305.
Frederick William, Great Elector of Brandenburg, 469.
Frederick William I, king of Prussia, 470, 471, III, campaign of Jena, 557, 558; at Tilsit, 560; IV, grants Constitution, 638.
Free Imperial Cities, 237, 238.
French and Indian War. See *Seven Years' War*.
French colonies, under Henry IV, 383; under Louis XIV, 413, 414; under Louis XV, 418; under Napoleon I, 546; at close of nineteenth century, 678–680.
Friedland (frēt'länt), battle of, 558.
Froissart (frwä-särʹ), 229.
Fronde, Wars of the, 404 n. 5.
Fulton, Robert, 554.
Fusillades (füs-ē-yädʹ), 534.

Gā'len, 191.
Galicia (ga-lish'i-ä), 558.
Galileo (gal-i-leʹō), 276 n. 1.
Gă'mä, Vasco da, 280, 281.
Garibaldi (gä-rē-bälʹdē), sketch of life, 625; in Sicily and Naples, 627, 628.
Gas'cons, the, 63 n. 2.
Ged'des, Janet, 428.
Geiseric, king of the Vandals, 14.
Gen'o-a, 181, 182.
Geography, knowledge of, in fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, 277–284.
George I, king of England, 484; II, 484; III, 484.
Gep'i-dæ, mentioned, 10 n. 5.
Gérard (zhā-rärʹ), Balthasar, 372.
German colonies, 680–682.
German Confederation, 634–636.
German Empire, New, formed, 645, 646; recent history of, 647–649.
German tribes. See *Teutons*.
Germany, conversion of German tribes, 20, 21; beginnings of the kingdom of, 233, 234; renewal of the empire by Otto the Great, 234; under the Hohenstaufen, 235, 236; the Electors, 236; the Interregnum, 237; the Free Imperial Cities, 237, 238; under the Hapsburgs, 240; humanism in, 297, 298; reformation in, 298–308; Thirty Years' War in, 387–394; Peace of Westphalia, 391–393; effects of Thirty Years' War upon, 393, 394; reorganized by Napoleon, 555, 556; coast lands annexed to France, 568; reorganized by Congress of Vienna, 584; Confederation, 634–636; Customs Union, 637; Revolution of 1848 in, 637–639; North German Confederation, 642, 643; German Empire formed, 645, 646. See *German Empire, New*.
Ghent, Pacification of, 369.
Ghibellines (gĭb'el-linz), the, 178 n. 5.
Ghiberti (gē-bĕrʹtē), sculptor, 267 n. 10.
Giants, regiment of, 471.
Gibbon, the historian, mentioned, 5.
Gibraltar, 413.
Gilds, the, 172.
Giotto (jŏtʹto), 268 n. 14.
Girondins (ji-ronʹdinz), in Legislative Assembly, 520; in Convention, 523, 526; execution of, 529.
Gladstone, William Ewart, Reform Bill of 1884, 604; disestablishment of Irish Church, 608; Irish Home Rule, 610; death, 610.
Gō-belʹ, 382.
Godfrey of Bouillon (godʹfrĭ bōō-yŏnʹ), 132; made head of Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, 133.
Goethe (gēʹte), at Erfurt, 565; cosmopolitanism of, 572 n. 26.
Golden Bull, the, 237 n. 18.
Good Hope, Cape of, discovered, 7.
Gordon, Charles George, general, 677.
Goths. See *Ostrogoths* and *Visigoths*.
Gournay (gōōr-nāʹ), Vincent de, 508 n. 7.
Granada, conquest of, 230, 231; Moriscos expelled from, 329.

Grand Alliance, of 1689, 411; of 1701, 412.
Grand Design of Henry IV, 383 n. 8.
Grand Remonstrance, the, 429 n. 9.
Gravelines (grăv-lēn′), battle of, 328 n. 10.
Gravelotte (grăv-lot′), battle of, 595.
Great Britain, the name, 315. See *England.*
Great Fire, the, at London, 445.
Great Moguls, the, 162.
Great Schism, the, 155, 156.
Greece, since 1864, 655 n. 2.
Greek Church, the, 32.
Greek Empire. See *Eastern Empire.*
Greek fire, 53.
Greek Independence, War of, 654 n. 1.
Greenland, discovered by the Northmen, 73.
Grévy (grā-vē′), 596 n. 10.
Grey, Jane, 349.
Grotius (grō′shi-us), Hugo, 282 n. 7.
Guadalquivir (gŭä-däl-kē-vēr′), river, 56.
Guebers (gē′bers). See *Fire-worshipers.*
Guelphs (gwĕlfs), the, 178 n. 5.
Guicciardini (gwē-chär-dē′nē), Francesco, 178.
Guillotine, the, 533.
Guinea, gulf of, discovered, 278.
Guiscard (gēs-kär′), Robert, 102, 103.
Guise (güēz), Francis, second duke of, 377, 378.
Guizot (gē-zō′), 592.
Gunpowder, effects of use in war, 90.
Gunpowder Plot, 421.
Gustavus I, Vasa, king of Sweden, 307; II, Adolphus, in Thirty Years' War, 389–390.
Gutenberg (gōō′ten-bĕrg), John, 263, 264.

Haarlem (här′lem), 369, n. 4.
Habeas Corpus Act, 446.
Hague (hāg), The, 701.
Haiti (hā′tī), in French Revolution, 546.
Hamburg, 173.
Hampden, John, 427.
Hanover, House of, in England, 484 n. 5.
Hanover, Prussia annexes, 642.
Hanseatic League, 173–175.
Hapsburg, House of. See *Austria, House of.*
Hardenburg, Prussian minister, 572 n. 27.
Hargreaves (här′grēvz), 494.
Harold, king of England, 104, 105.
Harun-al-Raschid (hä-rōōn′äl-räsh″-id), caliph, 55.
Hassan (hä′sen), 55 n. 9.
Hastings, battle of, 104.
Hav′e-lock, Henry, 673 n. 13.
Hébert (ā-bēr′), 530.
Hegira (hĕ-jī′rä or hĕj′i-rä), the, 48.
Heidelberg (hī′del-berg), 411.
Héloïse (ā-lō-ēz′), pupil of Abelard, 194.
Helvetic Republic, formed, 540.
Heng′ist, Jutish chief, 16.
Henry I, king of England, 108; II, 200; III, 203; V, 212; VII, at Bosworth Field, 215.
Henry III, Emperor H. R. E., 114; IV, 117–119; VI, 136.
Henry VII, king of England, reign, 335–337; VIII, reign, 337–347.
Henry II, king of France, 376; III, 380, 381; IV, marriage, 379; reign, 381–384.
Henry of Bourbon, king of Navarre, 379.
Henry the Cardinal, king of Portugal, 330.
Henry, Prince, the Navigator, 278.
Hep′tar-chy, Saxon, 12.
Her′a-clī″us, Eastern Emperor, reign, 44.
Hĕr′ī-ot, the, 85.
Hermits, 22, 23.
Herzegovina (hert-se-gō-vē′nä), revolt in, 659; administered by Austria-Hungary, 660.
Hesse-Cassel (hes′kas′el), annexed to Prussia, 642.
Hesse-Darmstadt (hes′därm′stät), 643.
High Commission Court, 426 n. 6.
Hil′de-brand. See *Pope Gregory VII.*
Hip-poc′ra-tēs, 191.

Hohenlinden, battle of, 545.
Hohenstaufen (hō″en-stow′fen), House of, Germany under, 235, 236.
Hohenzollern (hō′en-tsol-lern), House of, in Brandenburg, 469; in Prussia, 470.
Holland, kingdom of, created, 552; annexed to France, 568. See *Netherlands*.
Holstein (hōls′stīn), duchy of, 649; annexed to Prussia, 642.
Holy Alliance, 586.
Holy League of 1609, 387.
Holy Office. See *Inquisition*.
Holy Roman Empire, name attaches to Western Empire, 70; relations of, to the Papacy, 111–113; under Henry IV, 117–119; Concordat of Worms, 119; brought to ruin by the Papacy, 152, 153; results for Germany of the renewal of the imperial authority, 234; election of Charles V, 318; end of, 555, 556.
Holy Synod, established in Russia, 462.
Holy Wars. See *Crusades*.
Homage, ceremony of, 82.
Home Rule, Irish, 610, 611.
Hoorn (hōrn), count of, 366.
Ho-sain′, 55 n. 9.
Hos′pi-tal-ers, order of the, origin of, 133 n. 5; incident in history, 167; lose Rhodes, 322.
Howard, Catherine, 345.
Howard, John, 493 n. 18.
Howard of Effingham, 357.
Hubertsburg, Treaty of, 476.
Hudson Bay territory, 413.
Huguenots (hū′ge-nots), name, 377 n. 2; wars, 377–385; struggle with Richelieu, 385; after Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 410; Cromwell protects, 439.
Humanism, defined, 256; Petrarch, first of the humanists, 256–258; Boccaccio, as a humanist, 259; Chrysoloras, Greek teacher, 260; search for ancient manuscripts, 260; patrons of the New Learning, 261; fall of Constantinople gives impulse to, 262; translation and criticism of the classics, 262; invention of printing in relation to the revival, 263; humanism in the North, 265, 266; effects of the classical revival upon vernacular literatures, 272; at Oxford, 295; in Germany, 297, 298. See *Renaissance*.
Hum′ber, river, 105.
Humbert I, king of Italy, 629.
Hundred Days, the, 576–579.
Hundred Years' War, 208–215; results for France, 224.
Hungarians, conversion of, 128.
Hungary, overrun by Turks, 322; under Maria Theresa, 473; under Joseph II, 498; Revolution of 1848 in, 638 n. 2; in Austro-Hungarian monarchy, 650–653.
Huss, John, 239.
Hussites, the, 239.
Hutten (hōōt′ten), Ulrich von, 298.

Iceland, settled from Norway, 73.
Iconoclastic controversy, 31, 32.
Iconoclasts, in Netherlands, 366.
Illyrian Provinces, 566, 567.
Immunity, grants of, 82.
Incas, 287, 288.
Independents, English religious party (known at first as Separatists), in Civil War, 431, 432.
India, Portuguese in, 281; English in, 423, 476, 490, 491; French in, 413 n. 13, 419, 490, 491.
Indians, American, origin of name, 280.
Indulgences, defined, 299 n. 2; history of, 299, 300; granting of, by Tetzel, 301; Luther's theses on, 302, 303.
Industrial Democracy, 705–708.
Inquisition, the, in Languedoc, 143; in Spain, 232; procedure, 311, 312; in Netherlands, 364, 367; in Spain, 326, 327; in Spanish colonies, 616.
Instrument of Government, 437.
Interdict, effects of, 117.
Interregnum, the, in German history, 237.
Investiture, contest respecting, 116–120.
Iona (ī-ō′na or ē-ō′na), monastery of, 17.

Ionian Islands, annexed to France, 539; independent, 546; ceded to France, 559; ceded to Greece, 655 n. 2.
Ireland, conversion of, 17; under Elizabeth, 359; under James I, 423, 424; insurrection of 1641, 429; Cromwell in, 435; William III in, 452; legislative independence, 492; disestablishment of Church in, 607, 608; the Union, 609; in nineteenth century, 609–613.
Irene (ī-rē′nē or ī-rēn′), Eastern empress, 64.
Ire′ton, 443.
Iron Crown of Lombards, 11.
"Ironsides," Cromwell's, 431.
Isabella, queen of Castile, marriage to Ferdinand of Aragon, 230; sets up the Inquisition, 232; death, 232.
Islam. See *Mohammedanism.*
Istria, 566.
Italian city-republics, general account of, 175–179; causes of their early growth, 175, 176; the Lombard League, 176, 177; dissensions among, 178; despots in, 178, 179; Venice, 179–181; Genoa, 181, 182; Florence, 182, 183.
Italian colonies, 679 n. 19.
Italian Renaissance. See *Renaissance.*
Italy, results of Lombard conquest, 11; recovery of, by Justinian, 42; Renaissance in, 247; invaded by Charles VIII, 226; no national government during Middle Ages, 244; the Five Great States, 246, 247; at Congress of Vienna, 584, 619; since Congress of Vienna, 619–633; kingdom of, formed, 627, 628; *Italia irredenta,* 629 n. 2; relations of kingdom of, with Papacy, 630–632. See *Italian City-Republics* and *Renaissance.*
Ivan (e-vän′) III, the Great, tsar, 243, 455 n. 1; IV, the Terrible, 454, 455.

Jacobin Club, origin, 519; closed, 535.
Jacobites, support James II, 452.
Jaffa, 540.
Jamaica, 439.
James I, king of England, reign, 420–425; II, as Duke of York, 445; reign, 447, 448; attempt to recover throne, 452.
James IV, king of Scotland, marriage, 337; death, 338 n. 3; V, 354.
Jamestown, 423.
Jan′i-za-ries, the, 165.
Japan, awakening of, 687, 688; war with China, 688–690; the Imperial Regalia, 688 n. 27; war with Russia, 693–695.
Java, 674 n. 14.
Jeffreys, Chief Justice, 447 n. 16.
Jena (yā′nä), battle of, 558.
Jenghiz Khan (jĕn′gĭs-khän), 160.
Jerome of Prague, 239.
Jerome Bonaparte, king of Westphalia, 560.
Jerusalem, captured by crusaders, 133; Latin Kingdom of, 133; captured by Saladin, 135.
Jesuits, Society of the, 312–314; expelled from France, 597.
Jews, expelled from Spain, 232; political disabilities removed in England, 607.
Joan of Arc, 213, 214.
Joanna, queen of Castile, 318.
John, king of England, quarrel with Pope Innocent III, 150; becomes vassal of the papal see, 150; forfeits lands in France, 202; grants *Magna Carta,* 202.
John the Good, king of France, 211.
John VI, king of Portugal, 615 n. 2.
John of Austria, Don, at Lepanto, 330; in Netherlands, 370.
John of Leyden, 307 n. 10.
John Sobieski, king of Poland, 409.
Joseph II, Emperor H. R. E., 497–499.
Joseph Bonaparte, king of Spain, 563, 564.
Josephine, 567.
Jourdan (zhōōr-doṅ′), campaign of 1796, 537, 538.
Juan Ponce de Leon (pōn-thā dā lā-ōn′), 286 n. 11.
Jubilees, papal, 300.
Junot (zhü-nō′), 563.

Justinian, Era of, 42; his reign, 42–44; his code, 43.
Jutes, the, 12.

Kaaba (kä'bä, or kä-ā'bä), the, 46.
Känt, Immanuel, quoted, 699.
Kä-zän', 454.
Ker-män', 53 n. 7.
Khar-tûm', 677.
Khedive (kä'dēv''), 677.
Kiau-chau (kyow-chow), 682, 690.
Kiel (kēl), Treaty of, 583 n. 3.
Kiev (kē'ev), 161.
Kitchener, Lord, 677.
Kléber (klā-bĕr'), in Egypt, 540, 541; death, 545.
Knighthood. See *Chivalry*.
Knox, John, 354.
Konieh (kō'nē-e), 681.
Königgrätz (kē'nig-grĕts), battle of, 642.
Königsberg (kē'nigs-bĕrG), 142.
Kō'ran, the, origin of, 51; contents of, 51, 52.
Kō-rē'a, 688, 689, 694, 695.
Koreish (kō-rīsh'), Arab clan, 48.
Körner (kĕr'ner), 571.
Kosciuszko (kos-i-us'kō), 468.
Kossuth (kosh'o͞ot), Louis, 638 n. 2.
Kremlin, the, 574.
Krüg'er, Paul, 675.
Kublai Khan (ko͞ob'lī-khän), 162.
Kulturkampf (ko͞ol-to͞or'kampf), 647.
Ku-ro-pät'kin, Russian general, 694.
Kwang-chau-wan (kwäng-chow-wän), 690.

Labor Problem, the, 706, 707.
La Bruyère (lä brü-yĕr'), 417 n. 14.
Lafayette (lä-fā-yet'), in America, 508; in Constituent Assembly, 513; commands National Guard, 517.
Laibach (lī'bäch), Congress of, 615 n. 1.
Lamartine (lä-mär-tēn'), 592.
Lancaster, House of, 199 n. 1. See *Roses, Wars of the*.
Langland, William, 218.
Langton, Stephen, 150.
Languedoc (lang'gwē-dok), 143.
Langue d'Oc (läng'dŏk''), French dialect, 227.
Langue d'Oïl (läng'dwēl''), French dialect, 227.
Lapps, the, 22.
La Rochelle (lä rō-shel'), Huguenot stronghold, 382; siege of, 385.
La Salle (lä säl'), 418.
Läs Cä'säs, 289 n. 14.
Latimer, bishop, 350.
Latin Empire of Constantinople, 136–138.
Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, founded, 133; end of, 140.
Laud, William, 426, 428 n. 8.
Law, John, 418.
Legion of Honor, established, 550.
Legislative Assembly, French, 519–523.
Legnano (lăn-yä'nō), battle of, 177.
Leicester (lĕs'ter) Abbey, 340.
Leipzig (līp'tsiG), battle of (1631), 390; (1813), 575, 576.
Leo the Isaurian, 31, 32.
Leonardo da Vinci (lā-o-när'do dä vĭn'chē), 268.
Leopold I, Emperor H. R. E., 412.
Leopold I, king of the Belgians, 591; II, 668.
Leopold of Hohenzollern, offered Spanish crown, 644.
Le-pan'tō, battle of, 329, 330.
Les'seps, Ferdinand de, 597, 598.
Lessing, 572 n. 26.
Lettres de cachet (let'r-dē-ka-shā''), 501.
Leuthen (loi'ten), battle of, 474.
Lew'es, battle of, 204.
Lewis I, the Pious, king of the Franks, 68.
Leyden (lī'den), 369 n. 4.
Liberum veto, 467 n. 7.
Libraries, founding of, 261.
"Light Brigade," the, 657.
Ligurian Republic, formed, 538; annexed to France, 552.
Literature, English, Old English period, 19, 20; later mediæval period, 217–220; under Henry VIII, 346, 347; under Elizabeth, 360, 361; of the Puritan period, 442, 443; of the Restoration, 449, 450; of Queen Anne's Age, 483.
Literature, French, beginnings of, 227–229; under Louis XIV, 416, 417; in eighteenth century, 505–508.

Literature, German, beginnings of, 241, 242.
Literature, Spanish, beginnings of, 233.
Literatures, vernacular, beginnings of, 252; development fostered by classical revival, 272.
Liveries, Statute of, 336.
Livingstone, David, 667.
Llewellyn (lōō-ĕl'in) III, Welsh prince, 205.
Local Government Act, England, 605 n. 2; Scotland, 605 n. 2; Ireland, 605 n. 2.
Locke, John, 505 n. 5.
Lodi (lō'dē), battle of, 538 n. 27.
Lŏl'lards, the, 219.
Lombard League, 176, 177.
Lombards, kingdom of the, 10, 11; destroyed by Charles the Great, 63.
Lombardy, ceded to Austria, 583; to Sardinia, 627.
Loom, power, invented, 494.
Lorraine, part of, ceded to German Empire, 595, 646, 647.
Lo-thair', Emperor H. R. E., 68, 69.
Loubet (lōō-bā'), 596 n. 10.
Louis I, Prince of Condé (koṅ-dā'), 377.
Louis VII, king of France, 134; IX, 140 n. 9; XI, 225; XIII, 384–386; XIV, reign, 403–417; relations with Charles II, 445; with James II, 447; with William III, 452, 453; XV, reign, 417–419; death, 509; XVI, 509–524; XVII (dauphin), 528 n. 19; XVIII, accession, 576, 577; reign, 577–579, 589.
Louis Bonaparte, king of Holland, 552; abdication of, 568.
Louis Napoleon Bonaparte. See *Napoleon III.*
Louis Philippe, king of the French, 590–592.
Louisa, queen of Prussia, 560.
Louisburg, 486 n. 8.
Louisiana, granted to Mississippi Company, 418; ceded to France, 546; to United States, 553.
Low countries. See *Netherlands, Belgium.*
Lō-yō'lä, Ignatius of, 312, 313.
Lü'beck, 143; Peace of, 388; annexed to France, 568.
Lucerne, Lion of, 522 n. 14.
Lunéville (lü-nā-vēl'), Peace of, 545.
Luther, Martin, his pilgrimage to Rome, 301, 302; his ninety-five theses, 302, 303; his address to the Christian nobility of the German nation, 303, 304; burns the papal bull, 304; at the Diet of Worms, 304, 305; at the Wartburg, 305, 306; his death, 308.
Lutherans, 309.
Lutter (lōōt'ter), battle of, 388 n. 3.
Lützen (lüt'sen), battle of (1632), 390; (1813), 576.
Lyons, terror at, 534.

Macedonia, 660 n. 9.
Machiavelli (mäk-e-ä-vĕl'lē), Nicholas, 247; his *Prince*, 247, 248.
MacMahon (mäk-mä-ôṅ'), Marshal, 596 n. 10.
Madagascar, French in, 679.
Ma-drid', Treaty of, 321.
Magdeburg (mäg'de-bōōrg), sack of, by Tilly, 389, 390.
Magellan, Ferdinand, his circumnavigation of the globe, 282, 283; results of the achievement, 283, 284.
Mä-ĝen'tä, battle of, 626.
Magna Carta, 202, 203.
Magyars (mŏd'yŏrz"). See *Hungary.*
Mahdi (mä'dē), the, 677.
Mainz (mīnts), 263.
Mal-a-bär' coast, 281.
Malplaquet (mäl-plä-kā'), battle of, 412.
Mam'e-luke, 539.
Man-chu'rī-a, Chinese province, occupied by Russia, 684, 693.
Manorial system, the, 84–86.
Man'tū-ä, siege of, 538 n. 27.
Manuscripts, search for, by humanists, 260.
Marat (mä-rä'), 525; death, 526, 527.
Marches, the, union with Sardinia, 628.
Marco Pō'lō, mentioned, 146; at Mongol court, 162.
Ma-ren'gō, battle of, 545.
Margaret of Denmark, 249.

Margaret, Duchess of Parma, 365, 367.
Margaret of Valois, 379.
Margaret Tudor, 337.
Maria Theresa (mä-rē′ä te-rē′sä), wife of Louis XIV, 407 n. 7.
Maria Theresa, queen of Hungary, accession, 473; in partition of Poland, 467; in War of Austrian Succession, 473; in Seven Years' War, 474.
Marie Antoinette (mar′i an-toi-net′), marriage, 509; death, 528.
Marie Louise, 567.
Marienburg (mä-rē′ĕn-bo͝orG), 142.
Marlborough, Duke of, 412.
Marseillais (mär-se-lyā′), the six hundred, 522.
Marseillaise (mär-se-lyāz′), the, 522 n. 13.
Marseilles (mär-sālz′), 139.
Marston Moor, battle of, 431 n. 10.
Mary I, queen of England, birth, 339; persecuted by Edward VI, 349; reign, 349–351; marriage to Philip II, 349; II, 448–453.
Mary de' Medici (dā-mā′dē-chē), 384.
Mary Stuart, queen of Scots, 354–356.
Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, 118.
Matilda, Empress, 108.
Matthias (ma-thī′as), Emperor H. R. E., 387.
Maurice, stadtholder, 373.
Max-i-mil′ian I, Emperor H. R. E., 240.
Mayors of the Palace, 10.
Maz′a-rin, French minister, 404, 405.
Mazzini (mät-sē′nē), Joseph, 622, 623.
Mec′ca, 46.
Medici (med′ē-chē), Cos′i-mo de', 183 n. 8; Lorenzo de', 183 n. 8.
Medici, the, patrons of the New Learning, 261.
Medina (me-dē′na), 48, 49.
Melanchthon (me-langk′thon), 308 n. 12.
Mendicant friars. See *Dominicans* and *Franciscans*.
Menelik, king of Abyssinia, 679 n. 19.
Merovingians, Franks, under the, 9, 10.
Mer′ō-wig, 10 n. 4.
Methodists, rise of, 487, 488; demand religious equality, 606.
Metric system, 529.
Met′ter-nich, Prince, at Congress of Vienna, 585; policy of, 585; intervention in Two Sicilies, 620, 621; influence in Germany, 636; overthrow of, 638.
Metz, ceded to France, 392; siege of, 595.
Meuse (mūz), river, 68.
Mexico, conquest by Spain, 285–287.
Michael Angelo, 268.
Michael Románov, 455.
Mi-lan′ Decree, 561.
Milan destroyed by Frederick Barbarossa, 177.
Military and Religious Orders. See *Hospitalers* and *Templars*.
Milton, John, 442.
Mĭn″ne-sĭng′ers, 241.
Mir, the Russian, 657 n. 5.
Mirabeau (mē-rä-bō′), 512, 513, 514.
Mirandola, Pico della (me-rän′do-lä, pē′kō), 262 n. 7.
Mississippi Bubble, the, 418.
Missolonghi (mis-so-long′gē), 654 n. 1.
Moawiyah (mo-a-wē′yeh), caliph, 55.
Mō′de-nä, restoration in, 619; union with Sardinia, 627.
Mohammed, 48–51.
Mohammed II, sultan of the Ottomans, 166.
Mohammedanism, rise of, 46–51; doctrines, 51, 52; under earlier caliphs, 52–56; its law system, 56; polygamy under, 59; slavery, 59.
Mol-dā′vi-ä, partial independence of, 655; in Rumania, 666 n. 8.
Molière (mō-lyĕr′), 417.
Molt′ke, Von, 641.
Mō-luc′cas, the, 282.
Monasteries, suppression of, in England, 342–344.
Monasticism, defined, 22; its origin, 23; in the East, 23; in the West, 23, 24; the Benedictine monks, 25; monastic reform, 25, 26; services rendered by, to civilization, 26, 27.
Mongols, general account of their conquests, 160–164; their invasion of Russia, 161, 242.

Monk, George, 440.
Monks. See *Monasticism*.
Monmouth, Duke of, 447 n. 16.
Monroe Doctrine, 616, 617.
Montcalm (mont-käm′), 490.
Monte Cassino (mōn′tā käs-sē′nō), monastery, 24, 25.
Montenegro (mōn-te-nā′grō), 659, 660 n. 8.
Montesquieu (môn-tes-kyē′), 505.
Mon-tē-zu′mä, 286.
Montfort, Simon de, leader of the Albigensian crusade, 143; the English earl, 204.
Moore, Sir John, 566 n. 23.
Moors, the, 231.
More, Sir Thomas, humanist, 296; death, 342; his *Utopia*, 346, 347.
Moreau (mō-rō′), campaign of 1796, 537, 538; of 1800, 545.
Mor-gar′ten, battle of, 239 n. 20.
Moriscos, the, 231; under Charles V, 329; under Philip II, 329; expulsion of, 331, 332.
Morocco, 669 n. 6.
Morton, Cardinal, 336.
Moscow (mŏs′kō or mos′kow), Napoleon in, 574, 575.
Mountainists, the, 523.
Municipal Reform Act, 603.
Mün′ster, Anabaptists at, 307 n. 10; congress at, 391.
Münzer (münt′ser), 306.
Murat (mü-rä′), Joachim, 564.
Mus′cō-vy, 243.
Mutiny Act, 452 n. 19.

Näfels (nā′fels), battle of, 239 n. 20.
Nä′nä Sä′hib, 673 n. 13.
Nantes (nants; Fr. pron. nonṫ), Edict of, 382; revocation of, 409, 410, terror at, 534.
Naples, kingdom of, founded by Normans, 102, 103; laid claim to, by Charles VIII, 226; vicissitudes of its history, 235 n. 17; Murat, king of, 564 n. 19; becomes part of the kingdom of Italy, 627, 628.
Napoleon I, Bonaparte, guards Convention, 536; campaign in Italy, 537, 538; campaign in Egypt, 539, 540; overthrows Directory, 541; First Consul, 543–551; Emperor, 551–576; at Elba, 576; the Hundred Days, 576–579; at St. Helena, 579; II (King of Rome), born, 568; proclaimed, 578 n. 31; III, 592 n. 3; reign, 593–596.
När′vä, battle of, 463.
Naseby (nāz′bi), battle of, 432.
Nassau, 366 n. 2; annexed to Prussia, 642.
Nä-täl′, 676.
National Guards, French, organized, 514.
Nationality, principle of, 581.
Navarino (nä-vä-rē′nō), battle of, 654 n. 1.
Navarre, king of. See *Antony of Bourbon*, *Henry IV*.
Navigation Act (English) of 1651, 436.
Neck′er, French minister, 509; dismissed, 515.
Nelson, Horatio, at Abukir Bay, 540; at Trafalgar, 557.
Netherlands, the, the country, 363; the people, 363, 364; condition during the Middle Ages, 364; under Charles V, 364; under Philip II, 365–373; War of Independence, 366–374; submission of Catholic provinces (see *Belgium*), 370; independent union of seven Protestant provinces, 370; their Declaration of Independence, 371; Truce of 1609 with, 372–374; independent of Holy Roman Empire, 392; wars with Louis XIV, 407–413; war with England, 436; Batavian Republic (created in 1795), 552; kingdom of Holland, 552; annexed to France, 568; kingdom of, formed, 583.
Netherlands, Austrian, Catholic, Spanish. See *Belgium*.
Netherlands, Protestant, United. See *Netherlands*.
New Amsterdam, 444.
Newfoundland, Cabot's landfall, 337; England's title to, confirmed, 413.
New France. See *Canada*.
New Holland, 671 n. 9.
New Learning. See *Humanism*.
"New Model" army, formed, 431, 432.

New South Wales, 671.
Newton, Sir Isaac, 483.
New Zealand, 671.
Ney (nā), Marshal, 577.
Nibelungenlied (nē″bel-ung′en-lēt′), 241.
Ni-çæ′a, Church Council of, 15; captured by crusaders, 132.
Nice (nēs), ceded to France, 626.
Nicholas I, Tsar, 654–656; II, 662; calls the Peace Conference, 701.
Ni-cop′o-lis, battle of, 165.
Niemen (nē′men), river, 558.
Nihilists, 661, 662.
Nika (nē′kä) riot, the, 43.
Nimeguen (nim′ā-gen), Treaty of, 408.
Nineteenth century, character of its history, 290, 580, 581, 586, 587.
Nineveh, battle of, 44.
Nō′gi, Japanese general, 694 n. 29.
Norman Conquest of England, 103–109; political and social results for England, 109; effects upon English language and literature, 216, 217.
Normandy, origin of name, 72; in French history, 75, 76; dukes of, 102.
Normans, at home, 101, 102; in Italy and Sicily, 102, 103; in England, 103–109; as crusaders, 126, 127. See *Northmen.*
North German Confederation, 642, 643.
Northern countries, the. See *Scandinavians* and *Calmar, Union of.*
Northmen, 71–76. See *Scandinavians.*
Norway, 583; See *Calmar, Union of.*
Notables, Assembly of, 510.
Notre Dame (nō′tr dām), Paris, worship of Reason in, 530.
Nō-vä′rä, battle of, 624.
Nova Scotia ceded to England, 413.
Nŏv′gō-rŏd, 174.
Noyades (nwä-yäd′), 534.
Nystad (nü′städ), Peace of, 465.

Oates (ōts), Titus, 446.
Ocean Epoch, 285.
O'Connell, Daniel, 610.
Odoacer, 7.
Oktai (ŏk′tī), Mongol conqueror, 161, 162.
Old Sā′rum, 601.
O′mar, caliph, 52 n. 6.
Omeyyah (o-mī′yeh), 55 n. 9.
Ommeiades (om-mā′yadz), dynasty of the, 55.
O'Neill, Hugh, Earl of Tyrone, 359.
Opium War, 672 n. 12.
Orange Free State, 674, 675.
Orange River Colony, 675.
Orangemen, 452.
Ordeals, among the Teutons, 37–39.
Orders in Council (English), 561 n. 17.
Orellana (ō-rāl-yä′nä), Francisco de, 286 n. 11.
Or′le-anṣ (Fr. pron. or-lā-oṅ′), relief of, by Joan of Arc, 214.
Orleans, Philippe, Duke of, regent, 418.
Osnabrück, 391.
Os-tend′, 374 n. 7.
Ostrogoths, kingdom of the, 7, 8; destroyed by generals of Justinian, 8.
Oswy, king of Northumbria, 18, 19.
Oth-män′, caliph, 52 n. 6.
Othman I, Ottoman prince, 165.
Ō-trän′tō, 132.
Otto I, the Great, restores the Empire, 69, 70.
Otto, king of Greece, 655.
Ottomans. See *Turks.*
Ou″den-är′de, battle of, 412.
Oxenstiern (oks′en-stērn), 391.
O-yä′mä, Field Marshal, 694.

Paine, Thomas, 523.
Palatinate, War of the, 410, 411; devastation of, 411.
Păl′imp-sests, 261 n. 6.
Pamirs (pä-mērz′), 684.
Pä-nä-mä′, Scotch colony on isthmus of, 482; canal, 598.
Papacy, origin of its temporal authority, 62; claims of primacy by the Roman bishops, 27, 28; circumstances that favored growth, 28–33; Concordat of Worms, 119; relations of, to the H. R. E., 111–113; revival of power in eleventh century, 113; under Gregory VII, 114–119; under Alexander III, 149; under Innocent III, 149, 150; effects

the ruin of the Empire, 152, 153; under Boniface VIII, 153, 154; removal of papal seat to Avignon, 155; the Great Schism, 155, 156; reforming Church Councils, 156; is still a spiritual theocracy, 157, 158; end of temporal power of, 630; relations with Italian government, 630–632; with German, 647; infallibility of, 630 n. 5. See *Popes*.
Papal States, annexed to France, 567; revolutions in, 621, French garrison in, 629; annexation to kingdom of Italy, 629. See *Papacy*.
Paraphrase of the Scriptures, 20.
Paris, Peace of (1763), 475, 491; (1783), 492; (1814), 576 n. 28; (1815), 578 n. 32; (1856), 657.
Paris, siege of (1870), 646.
Parish Councils Act, 605 n. 2.
Parliament, English, creation of House of Commons, 203–205; Model Parliament, 204 n. 5; effects upon, of Hundred Years' War, 214, 215; the Long Parliament, 428–437; the Little Parliament, 437; Convention, 448; union of English and Scotch Parliaments, 481–483.
Parma, Alexander, Duke of, 370.
Parr, Catherine, 345.
Pär'sees, the. See *Fire-Worshipers*.
Parsifal (pär'sē-fäl), poem of, 241.
Pär"the-nō-pē'an Republic, 540, 541.
Pascal, 417 n. 14.
Patriarch, Russian, office abolished, 462.
Patricius (pa-trish'ius). See *St. Patrick*.
Pavia (pä-vē'ä), battle of, 321.
Pax Romana, 125.
Peace Conference at The Hague, 701.
Peace of God, 125.
Peasants' Revolt, in England, 211, 212.
Peasants' War, 306.
Pedro I, Emperor of Brazil, 615 n. 2.
Pē-king', siege of embassies at, 690, 691.
Père Duchesne (pēr dü-shān'), 531.
Perry, Commodore, 687.
Persia, conquest of, by Saracens, 52, 53; Russian and English interests in, 683.
Peru, Spanish conquest of, 287, 288; Spanish oppression of natives in, 289 n. 14.
Pestilence, the Great. See *Black Death*.
Pestilence, in Justinian's reign, 44.
Peter I, the Great, Tsar, 455–466; III, 475.
Peter the Hermit, legend of, 129; heads an expedition, 132.
Peter of Lombard, Schoolman, 159 n. 5.
Petition of Right, 425.
Petrarca (pā-trär'kä), Francesco. See *Petrarch*.
Petrarch, as a humanist, 256–258; his feeling for the ruins of Rome, 258; his ascent of Mount Ventoux, 259 n. 4; his critical spirit, 273.
Philip I, the Handsome, king of Castile, 318; II, king of Spain, reign, 326–331; III, expels Moriscos, 331, 332; war with Dutch, 332; IV, 407; V, 411.
Philip II, Augustus, king of France, in Third Crusade, 135; his quarrel with Pope Innocent III, 150; seizes English possessions in France, 202; IV, the Fair, his quarrel with Pope Boniface VIII, 153, 154; summons the commons to the National Assembly, 222, 223; destroys the order of the Templars, 223.
Philip, Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, 73.
Philippines, discovered, 283; United States in, 686 n. 26.
Philosophy, French, in eighteenth century, 505–508.
Piacenza (pē-ä-chen'zä), Church Council at, 130.
Piedmont. See *Sardinia*.
Pilgrim Fathers, 354, 423.
Pilgrimages, 122.
Pious Fund case, 701.
Pippin III, king of the Franks, 61, 62.
Pisa (pē'zä), 181 n. 7; Church Council of, 156.

Pitt, William, Earl of Chatham, 489, 490.
Pitt, William, opposition to Napoleon, 544, 554, 555; prophecy concerning Napoleon, 570, 571.
Pi-zär′rō, Francisco, 288.
Plăn-tăg′e-net, House of, 199 n. 1.
Plassey, battle of, 490.
Plato, quoted, 183 n. 11.
Plev′nä, siege of, 659.
Poitiers (poi-tērz′), battle of (1356), 210, 211.
Poland, Charles XII invades, 463; partitions of, 467 n. 7, 468; under Napoleon, 559; Russian kingdom of, 583; revolt in, 655.
Politian (pō-lĭsh′i-an), 262.
Poltáva (pol-tä′vä), battle of, 464.
Pom-e-rā′ni-ä, Western, ceded to Sweden, 392; Eastern, ceded to Brandenburg, 392.
Pompadour (pôn-pä-dōōr′), Madame de, 418.
Pondicherry (pon-di-sher′i), founded, 413 n. 13; captured by English and restored, 491 n. 15.
Pope, Alexander, 483.
Popes: Gregory I, 16, 30 n. 4; Leo I, the Great, 28, 29; Nicholas I, 28; Stephen II, 62; Leo III, 64; Gregory VII, 114–119; Nicholas II, 113 n. 4; Urban II, 129, 130; Innocent III, 149, 150; Alexander III, 148, 149; Boniface VIII, 153, 154; Urban VI, 156; Clement VII (anti-pope), 156; Gregory IX, 156; Alexander V, 156; Martin V, 157; Nicholas V, 261, Julius II, 261; Leo X, 261; Alexander VI, 281; Julius II, 336; Leo X, 301; Clement VII, 340; Pius V, 356; Gregory XIII, 380; Sixtus V, 356; Pius VI, 540; Pius VII, at Napoleon's coronation, 551; prisoner, 567; Pius IX, 624; death, 630, n. 7; Leo XIII, 630 n. 7; Pius X, 630 n. 7. See *Papacy*.
Popish Plot, the, 446.
Popular sovereignty, principle of, 581.
Port Arthur, ceded to Japan, 689; leased to Russia, 690; fortified by Russia, 693; siege of, 694.
Porto Rico, 686 n. 26.
Portugal, kingdom of, 141; annexed to Spain, 330; French invasion of, 563; revolution of 1820, 615 n. 2; republic of, 615 n. 2.
Portuguese colonies, early explorations, 278; in India, 281; in Brazil, 281 n. 5.
Potato introduced into Europe, 360.
Pragmatic Sanction, 472.
Prague (prāg), Treaty of (1866), 642.
Prayer, Book of Common, 348.
Pressburg (pres′bŏrg), 555 n. 9.
Prestonpans, battle of, 487.
Pretender, the Young, 487.
Pride's Purge, 432.
Prime Minister, origin of, in England, 484, 485.
Prince, the, by Machiavelli, 247.
Printing, invention of, 263; in China, 263.
Privileges, abolition of, in France, 515, 516.
Protectorate in England, 438–440.
Protestant Revolution, defined, 292. See *Reformation*.
Protestants, origin of name, 308; divisions among, 309, 310.
Protestation, the Great, 423.
Provençal (prŏ″vän′sal″) speech, 227.
Provence (prō′vŏns″), 225, 323.
Prussia, foundations of, laid by Teutonic Knights, 142; under the Great Elector, 469; becomes a kingdom, 470; in eighteenth century, 470–479; war with French Revolution, 520; war with Napoleon, 557, 558; regeneration of, 571–573; gains at Congress of Vienna, 583; in Holy Alliance, 586; in Germanic Confederation, 634–636; in Customs Union, 637; Revolution of 1848 in, 638; war with Denmark, 640; with Austria, 641, 642; with France, 594–596, 643–645; forms North German Confederation, 642, 643; head of new German Empire, 645–649.
Public Safety, Committee of, first, 525; second or Great, 527, 531; of Communists, 596.

Purgatory, 299, 300.
Puritans, under Elizabeth, 357; rule of, 430–443; customs of, 449.
Pym, John, 430.
Pyramids, battle of the, 539.
Pyrenees, Treaty of the, 404.

Quebec, founded, 383; battle of, 490.
Quesnay (kā-nā′), 508 n. 7.
Quir′i-nal, the, 630 n. 6.
Quito (kē′tō), 288.

Racine (rä-sēn′), 417.
Radetzky (rä-det′skē), 624.
Raleigh (rȧ′li), Sir Walter, 360, 424.
Ramillies (rä-mē-yē′), battle of, 412.
Raphael (răf′ā-el), 268.
Rastadt, Treaty of, 413.
Ravaillac (rä-vä-yäk′), 384.
Ravenna, 42.
Raymond IV, count of Toulouse, 132; VI, 142; VII, 143.
Reason, worship of, 530.
Reform Bill, English, of 1832, 601, 602; of 1867, 604; of 1884, 604.
Reformation, defined, 292; causes of, 292–295; precursors of, 295; question of indulgences, 299–301; Luther, 301–306; reaction from, 308–314; results of, 315, 316; in England, character of, 334, 335; the revolt from Rome, 341–345; the reform under Edward VI, 347–349; the reaction under Mary, 349–351; reform completed under Elizabeth, 353; in France, 376.
Regency, the French, 418.
Renaissance (*re*-nā′säṇs″: the italic *e* here has the obscure sound of *e* in novel), the, defined, 251; causes and antecedents, 251–254; the revival in Italy, 255–269; humanism, 256–266; the artistic revival, 266–269; general effects, 269–274; relation to religious reform, 273. See *Humanism*.
Renaissance in France, 323.
Restoration, English, 440, 441; French, 576, 578.
Reuchlin (roiċh-lēn′ or roiċh′lĭn), humanist, 265, 298.
Revenue of English crown settled, 451, 452.
Revival of Learning. See *Renaissance*.
Revolution, Protestant, 292; Puritan, 430–443; of 1688, 448; Industrial, 493–495; American, 491, 492; its influence, 508; French, of 1789, 500–542; its principles, 580, 581; of July, 1830, 590, 591; of February, 1848, 591, 592; Belgian, of 1830, 591; German, of 1830, 636, 637; of 1848, 637–639; Italian, of 1820, 620; of 1830, 621; of 1848, 623, 624; Polish, of 1830, 655; Portuguese, of 1820, 615 n. 2; Spanish, of 1820, 614, 615.
Revolutionary Tribunal, French, established, 525; work of, 528, 533.
Rheims (rēmz), 214.
Rhodes, Cecil, 676.
Richard I, king of England, 135, 136; III, 215.
Richard of Cornwall, 237.
Richelieu (rēsh-lyē′), Cardinal, 384–386.
Ridley, 350.
Rienzi (rē-en′zē), tribune of Rome, 244–246.
Rights, English Bill of, 450, 451.
Rimini (rē′mē-nē), 62.
River Epoch, 284.
Rivoli (rē′vo-lē), battle of, 538 n. 27.
Robert the Magnificent, Duke of Normandy, 103
Roberts, Lord, 675.
Robespierre (rō-bes-pyĕr′), in Constituent Assembly, 514; in Convention, 523; in Committee of Public Safety, 527, 531, 532; death, 534.
Rois fainéants (rwä fā-nā-oṅ′), 10.
Roland (rō-loṅ′), Madame, 529.
Rō′land, paladin, 63 n. 2.
Rollo, Scandinavian chief, 75.
Romagna (rō-män′yä), the, united with the Sardinian kingdom, 627.
Roman Empire, restored in the West, by Charlemagne, 64, 65; renewed by Otto the Great, 69, 70. See *Eastern Empire* and *Holy Roman Empire*.
Roman law, revival of, 40, 41; Justinian Code, 43.
Roman Republic, 540, 624.

Romance languages, 35.
Romance nations, 34, 35.
Rō-mä′nov or Rō-mä′noff, House of, 455.
Rome, relation of the fall of, to world history, 3; its bequest to civilization, 4: sack of (1527), 321; capital of Italy, 629.
Roncesvalles (ron-se-väl′lĕs; Sp. rōn-thes-väl′yes), Pass of, 63 n. 2.
Ros′a-mund, story of, 10 n. 5.
Roses, Wars of the, 215, 216.
Ross′bäch, battle of, 474.
Rouen (rōō-oń′), 75.
Rouget de Lisle (rōō-zhā′ dê lēl), 522 n. 13.
Roundheads, 430.
Rousseau (rōō-sō′), 506, 507.
Roussillon (roo′sĕl′yŏń′), 225, 404.
"Royal Touch," the, 421 n. 2.
Rumania or Roumania (rōō-mā′ni-a), 660, 663.
Rumelia or Roumelia (rōō-mē′li-a), Eastern, 660 n. 8.
Runnymede (rŭn′ĭ-mēd), 202.
Rupert, Prince, 431.
Ru′rik, Scandinavian chief, 73, 74, 242.
Russia, introduction of Christianity into, 21; receives elements of civilization from Constantinople, 45; the Mongol invasion, 242; rise of Muscovy, 243; freed from the Mongols, 243; under Ivan the Terrible, 454, 455; under Peter the Great, 455–466; under Catherine the Great, 466–468; in Seven Years' War, 475; war with French Republic, 541; with Napoleon, 573–575; gains at Congress of Vienna, 583; in Holy Alliance, 586; since French Revolution, 654–663; Asiatic expansion of, 682–685.
Russo-Japanese War, 693–695.
Russo-Turkish War, of 1828–1829, 654, 655; of 1877–1878, 658–660.
Ruy Diaz (dē′äth), 233.
Rys′wick, Treaty of, 411.

Sadowa (sä′dō-vä), battle of, 642.
St. Albans (ạl′banz), first battle of, 215.
St. An′selm, 193.
St. Antony, 23.
St. Bartholomew's Day, massacre of, 379, 380.
St. Benedict, 24, 25.
St. Bĕr′nard, preaches crusade, 134; controversy with Abelard, 193.
St. Bernard, Great Pass, 545.
St. Boniface (bŏn′e-făss). See *Winfrid.*
St. Co-lum′ba, 17.
St. Dom′i-nic, 151.
St. Francis, 151.
St. Gall, monastery of, 17 n. 3.
St. Gallus, monk, 17 n. 3
St. Germain (saṅ zher-maṅ′), Treaty of, 379.
St. Helena, 579.
St. John, Knights of. See *Hospitalers.*
St. Louis, 140 n. 9.
St. Patrick, 17.
St. Paul's Cathedral, London, 445 n. 15.
St. Peter, 28.
St. Peter's, Rome, 301.
St. Petersburg, founded, 463.
St. Quentin (saṅ koṅ-taṅ′), battle of, 328 n. 10.
St. Sim′e-on Sty-lī′tēṣ, 23, 24.
St. Wil′frid, 18.
Săl′a-din, 135, 136.
Sạ-lér′nō, 119.
Salisbury, Gemot of, 106.
Salisbury (sạlz′bu-ri), Marquis of, 611.
Säm-är-cänd′, 162.
San Marino (mä-rē′nō), 619.
Sän Stef′ä-nō, Treaty of, 660 n. 7.
Sans Souci (soṅ sōō-sē′), 478.
Saracens, name, 46; their conquests, 52–54; their civilization, 56–59. See *Arabs* and *Moors.*
Sardinia, kingdom of, defeated by Bonaparte, 538; revolution of 1820 in, 621; of 1848, 623, 624; in Crimean War, 625; war with Austria, 626, 627; annexations of territory, 627, 628; becomes kingdom of Italy, 628.
Sä-vo-nä-rō′lä, Girolamo (jĕ-rō′lämō), 248, 249.
Savoy, ceded to France, 626.
Saxons, continental, subjugated by Charlemagne, 63. See *Anglo-Saxons.*

Saxony, becomes a kingdom, 559 n. 14; part ceded to Prussia, 583.
Scandinavians, conversion of, 21; as pirates and colonizers, 71, 72; colonization of Iceland and Greenland, 73; discovery of America by, 73; saga literature of Iceland, 73 n. 1; in Russia, 73; Danes in England, 74, 75; Northmen in Gaul, 75; transformation of, 72; Norse factor in French history, 75, 76. See *Calmar, Union of.*
Scharn'horst, 573.
Schleswig (shlās'vig) or Sleswick, duchy of, 640; annexed to Prussia, 642.
Schleswig-Holstein War, 640, 641.
Schmalkaldic League, 323.
Scholasticism, in conflict with humanism, 297, 298. See *Schoolmen.*
Schoolmen, nature of their task, 192; controversy of the Nominalists and Realists, 193 n. 4; the earlier Schoolmen, 192, 193; Abelard, 193, 194; the Schoolmen of the thirteenth century, 194; Albert the Great, 194; Thomas Aquinas, 194, 195; Duns Scotus, 195; Roger Bacon, 195; last of the Schoolmen, 196; their services to intellectual progress, 196.
Schwyz (shwīts), 238.
Scone (skōōn), Stone of, 207.
Scotland, wars with England, 206–208; under James IV, 337, 33 n. 3; union of Scottish and English crowns, 420; of their parliaments, 481–483; under Charles I, 427, 428; Cromwell in, 435, 436.
Scriptorium, 27.
Scutage (skū'tāj), defined, 203 n. 3.
Sea Epoch, 284.
Secularization of Church property, 307; in France, 518.
Sedan (sê-doṅ'), battle of, 595.
Sedgemoor, battle of, 447 n. 16.
Seeley, Professor J. R., quoted, 480, 697.
Seine (sān), river, 75.
Self-denying ordinance, 431, 432 n. 11.
Sempach (sem'päk), battle of, 239 n. 20.
Sen-e-gal', 679.
Separatists, 354.
Sepoy Mutiny, 673.
Sepoys, 490 n. 13.
September Massacre in French Revolution, 522.
Serfs, under feudal system, 84–86; Russia emancipates, 657, 658.
Ser-vē'tus, 312.
Servia, independence of, 666 n. 8.
Settlement, Act of, 452 n. 19.
Sē-vas'tō-pōl, siege of, 657.
Seven bishops, trial of the, 447, 448.
Seven Weeks' War, 641, 642.
Seven Years' War, 474–476, 488–491.
Sévigné (sā-vēn-yā'), Madame de, 417 n. 14.
Seville (sĕv'il), 54.
Seymour, Lord Henry, 357.
Seymour, Jane, 345.
Sforza (sfort'sä), Francesco, 247 n. 23.
Shaftes'bu-ry, third earl of, 505 n. 5.
Shakespeare, 361.
Shiahs (shē'äz), Moslem sect, 55 n. 9.
Ship money, 427.
Siberia, Russia in, 455, 685.
Sicilian Vespers, 235 n. 17.
Sicily, kingdom of. See *Naples, kingdom of.*
Sieyès(sē-ā-yās'), 514.
Si-lē'si-a, seized by Frederick the Great, 473.
Simon Magus, 115 n. 5.
Sĭm'o-ny, 115–117.
Siraj-ud-Daula (sē-räj'ōōd-dow'lä), 490 n. 14.
Slave trade, African, beginning of the, 278; the Assiento, 481; England abolishes, 493.
Slavery, abolished in English colonies, 602 n. 1.
Slaves, number in Middle Ages, 84 n. 6.
Slavs, at opening of the Middle Ages, 6. See *Russia.*
Smith, Sidney, 540.
Smo-lensk', 574.
Sobieski (sō'byĕ-skē), John, 409.
Social Democrats, German, 707, 708.
Socialism, in French Revolution of 1848, 592 n. 2; of to-day, 649 n. 11; 707, 708.

Soissons (swäs'sôn''), battle of, 10.
Solferino (sol-fe-rē'nō), battle of, 626.
Sol'y-man, the Magnificent, Sultan, rival of Charles V, 320.
Sophia, Electress of Hanover, 484.
Sō'tō, Ferdinand de, 286 n. 11.
South Sea Bubble, 485, 486.
Spain, conquest of, by Saracens, 54; during the Crusades, 141; early history, 229, 230; union of Castile and Aragon, 230; conquest of Granada, 230, 231; influence upon national character of the Moorish domination and wars, 231; the Inquisition under Ferdinand and Isabella, 232; under Charles V, 318–325; under Philip II, 326–331; under Philip III, 331, 332; war with England, 356–359; war with Netherlands, 366–374; in the Napoleonic Era, 563, 564, 566; since 1815, 614–618.
Spanish-American War, 686 n. 26.
Spanish colonies, beginnings, 288; Spain loses her continental American dependencies, 615–617; loses her insular possessions, 618.
Spanish Fury, the, 369.
Spanish March, 63.
Spanish Succession, War of the, 411–413; England's gains in, 481.
Spenser, Edmund, 361.
Spinning jenny invented, 494.
Spires (Ger. Speyer), second diet of, 308.
Stanley, Henry M., 667, 668.
Star Chamber, court of, 426 n. 6.
States-General, French, 223; of 1789, 511–513.
Statute for the Burning of Heretics, 219.
Statute of Laborers, 211.
Stein, Baron vom (stīn), 572 n. 27, 573.
Stephen of Blois (blwä), king of England, 108.
Stephenson, George, 705.
Stirling, battle of, 207 n. 6.
Stoessel (stĕs'sel), Russian general, 694 n. 29.
Strafford (Thomas Wentworth), Earl of, 426, 428.
Sträl'sund, siege of, 388 n. 3.
Strasburg (Ger. Strassburg; Fr. Strasbourg), seized by Louis XIV, 408, 409.
Strassburg (sträs'börg), oath of, 69 n. 6.
Streltsi, disbanded, 461.
Stuart, Henry, Lord Darnley, 355.
Stuart, House of, in England, 420.
Sty-li'tes, Simeon, 23, 24.
Sudan (sōō-dän'), 677, 679.
Suez Canal, 597.
Sully (sul'i), Duke of, 383.
Sŭn'na, the, 52.
Sŭn'nītes, Moslem sect, 55 n. 9.
Supremacy, Act of, under Henry VIII, 342; under Elizabeth, 353.
Supreme Being, worship of, 532.
Surat (sōō rät'), English at, 423; French at, 413 n. 13, 423.
Sweden, in Thirty Years' War, 389–391; gain in Peace of Westphalia, 392; under Charles XII, 462, 463, 464; union with Norway, 583 n. 3. See *Calmar, Union of.*
Swift, Jonathan, 483.
Swiss Confederation, the, rise of, 238, 239; independent of Holy Roman Empire, 392; French intervention in, 540; as a federal state, 646 n. 8, 698.
Swiss Guards, of Tuileries, 521, 522 n. 14.
Switzerland. See *Swiss Confederation.*
Sy-ā'gri-us, 10.
Sybel (sē'bel), quoted, 639.
Syria, conquest of, by Saracens, 52.

Taj Mahal (täzh ma-häl'), the, 162.
Talleyrand (tal'i-rand), at the Restoration, 576.
Tăm-er-lāne'. See *Timur.*
Tancred (tang'kred), 132.
Tees (tēz), river, 105.
Tell, William, legend of, 239.
Templars, order of the, origin, 133 n. 5; abolition of, 223, 224.
Temple of Peace, the, 701.
Terror, Reign of, 527–535.
Terrorism in Russia, 662.
Test Act, 445, 446 n. 15*a*, 606.
Tetzel, John, 301.

Teutonic Knights, order of the, origin, 134; in Baltic region, 142; property secularized, 307.
Teutons, capacity for improvement, 4; kingdoms established by, 7–13; their conversion, 14–22; fusion with the Latins, 34–41; personality of Teutonic laws, 36, 37; ordeals among, 37–39.
The-od'ō-ric, king of the Ostrogoths, 7, 8.
Thessaly, 655 n. 2.
Thiers (tyēr), 595, 596.
Third Estate, the, beginnings of, in the towns, 185, 186; French, under the Bourbons, 503–505; in States-General, 511–513.
Thirty Years' War, the, 387–394.
Thomas Becket, 200, 201; shrine destroyed, 343.
Thomas à Kem'pis, 297 n. 1.
Thôr, German deity, 16.
Thorvaldsen (tor'vâld-zen), 522 n. 14.
Tiberine Republic, of 1798, 540, 541; of 1848, 624.
Tiers État (tyâr'zā'tä''; Eng. pron. tērz'ā-tā''). See *Third Estate.*
Tilly, 388, 390.
Tilsit, Treaty of, 558–560.
Tim-buk'tu, 679.
Timur (tī-mo͞or'), Mongol conqueror, 162.
Tintoretto (tin-tō-ret'tō), 268 n. 14.
Titian (tish'an), 268.
Tobacco, introduced into Europe, 360 n. 7.
Todleben (tōt'lā-ben), 657.
Tō'go, Japanese admiral, 694 n. 29.
Toleration, religious, influence upon, of the Protestant Reformation, 316, 394.
Tories, the party of conservatism, 602.
Toul (to͞ol), 392.
Toulon (to͞o-lôn'), siege of, 536 n. 25.
Tournament (to͞or'na-ment), the, 96, 97.
Tours (to͞or), battle of, 54.
Toussaint Louverture (to͞o-saṅ'lo͞o-ver-tür'), 546 n. 2.
Tower of London, 106.
Towns, effects upon, of Crusades, 144; suffer from barbarian invasion, 169; rapid growth in tenth and eleventh centuries, 169, 170; status of the chartered towns, 171, 172; their industrial life, 172; they enter the feudal system, 170; their revolt, 172; towns in Germany, 173–175; in Italy, 175–183; their services to civilization, 183–186; their representatives in national assemblies, 185, 186; centers of new intellectual life, 186. See *Hanseatic League* and *Italian city-republics.*
Tow'ton Field, battle of, 215.
Traf-al-gär', naval battle of, 557; importance of, 561.
Trans-Siberian Railway, 685.
Transvaal, the, 674, 675; becomes Transvaal Colony, 675.
Trek, The Great, 674.
Trent, Church Council of, 310, 311.
Trieste (trē-est'), 653.
Triple Alliance, of 1668, 319 n. 1; of 1882, 648.
Troppau (trop'pou), Congress of, 615 n. 1.
Trou'ba-dours, the, 227, 228.
Trouveurs (tro͞o'vēr''), the, 228, 229.
Troyes (trwä), Treaty of, 213.
Truce of God, 125, 126; proclaimed by Council of Clermont, 131.
Tsar, title assumed, 455.
Tudor, House of, 334 n. 1.
Tudor, Owen, 206.
Tuileries (twē'le-riz), 524.
Tunis, French protectorate, 678.
Turanians. See *Mongols* and *Turks.*
Turgot (tür-gō'), 508 n. 7, 509.
Turks, Ottoman, beginnings of their empire, 164; their conquests, 165–167; they capture Constantinople, 166; check to their arms, 167; wars with Philip II, 329, 330; with Austria, 409; with Catherine the Great, 466; with Bonaparte, 540; with Greece, 654 n. 1; with Russia (1828–1829), 654, 655; (1853–1856), 656, 657; (1877–1878), 658–660.
Turks, Seljuk, 123; power broken, 129, 143.
Tuscany, union with Sardinia, 627.
Two Sicilies. See *Naples, Kingdom of.*
Tyburn, 443.
Tyler, Wat, 212.
Tyrone (ti-rōn'), Earl of, 359.

Uitlanders (oit'land-erz), 675.
Ukraine (ū'krān), 464.
Ul'fi-las, apostle of the Goths, 14.
Ulm (o͞olm), 555.
Ulster, plantation of, 423, 424.
Umbria, union with Sardinia, 628.
Uniformity, Act of, under Edward VI, 349; under Elizabeth, 353.
Union (parliamentary) of England, with Scotland, 481–483; with Ireland, 609.
Union, The Interparliamentary, 701, 703.
United Provinces. See *Netherlands*.
United States, independence of, 492; War of 1812, 562; Monroe Doctrine, 616, 617; expansion of, 685–687.
Universities, rise of the, 187, 188; faculties, 188 n. 1; "Nations" in, 189; students and student life, 189; studies and methods of instruction, 191. See *Schoolmen*.
Unterwalden (o͞on'ter-väl"den), 238.
Ural (o͞o'ral) Mountains, 455.
Uri (o͞o'rī), 238.
U-tō'pi-a, More's, 346, 347.
Utrecht (ū'trekt), Union of, 370; Peace of, 413.

Väl'lä, Laurentius, 273.
Valladolid (väl-yä-thō-lēth'), 365.
Valmy (väl-mē'), battle of, 523.
Valois (väl-wä'), House of, 224 n. 13, 376 n. 1; history of France under the mediæval Valois sovereigns, 224–227; in the sixteenth century, 376–381.
Vandals, kingdom of the, 9; destroyed by Belisarius, 9.
Vane, Sir Henry, 434, 436; death, 443.
Vassy (vä-sē'), massacre of, 377, 378.
Vat'i-can, relations to France, 547, 548 n. 3.
Vauban (vō-boṅ'), 407.
Vaudois (vō-dwä'), 323.
Vaux (vō), Pierre de, 323 n. 6.
Vendée (voṅ-dā'), La, 526.
Ve-nē'tia, ceded to Austria, 538, 539; joined to Napoleon's kingdom of Italy, 555; becomes part of the new kingdom of Italy (1866), 628.
Venice, takes part in Fourth Crusade, 136, 137; sketch of history, 179–181; ceremony of wedding the Adriatic, 180; her "Arsenal," 180, 181.
Venice, Peace of, 149.
Ventoux (voṅ-to͞o'), Mountains, 259 n. 4.
Vĕr-dŭṅ', Treaty of, 68, 69.
Vergniaud (vern-yō'), 527 n. 18.
Verona (vā-rō'nä), Congress of, 615 n. 1.
Veronese (vā-rō-nā'zā), 268 n. 14.
Versailles (vêr-sālz'; Fr. pron. ver-sāy'), palace of, 415.
Vervins (ver-vaṅ'), Treaty of, 382 n. 5.
Vespucci, Amerigo (ves-po͞ot'chē, ä-mā-rē'go), 280.
Victor Emmanuel I, king of Sardinia, reactionary policy of, 620; abdication of, 621; II, 624; king of Italy, 627, 628; III, 629 n. 4.
Vienna (vi-en'ä; Ger. Wien), siege of (1683), 409; Congress of, 577, 581–585.
Villafranca (vēl-lä-fräng'kä), Peace of, 627.
Villain. See *Serfs*.
Vincennes (vaṅ-sen'), France, 550.
Virginia, origin of name, 360.
Visconti (vēs-kon'tē), family of the, 247 n. 23.
Visigoths, kingdom of the, 8, 9.
Vlăd'i-mir the Great, of Russia, 21.
Vogelweide (fō'gel-vī'de), Walther von der, 241.
Voltaire (vol-tēr'), 478, 505, 506.

Wager of battle. See *Ordeals*.
Wagram (vä'gräm), battle of, 566.
Wal-den'sēs, 323.
Waldo (väl-dō'), Peter, 323 n. 6.
Wales, conquest of, 205, 206.
Waliszewski (vä-lĭ-shĕv'ski), quoted, 456.
Wallace, Sir William, 207.
Wallachia (wŏ-lā'kĭ-ä), partial independence of, 655; in kingdom of Rumania, 660 n. 8.
Wallenstein (wol'en-stīn; Ger. pron. väl'len-stīn), 388, 389, 391.
Walpole, Sir Robert, 485.
Walsingham, Sir Francis, 353.
Walter the Penniless, 132.

Wardship, feudal right of, 84 n. 4.
Warsaw, Grand Duchy of, formed, 559; given to Russia, 583.
Wartburg (värt'bōōrg), Luther at, 305, 306.
Waterloo, battle of, 578.
Watt, James, 494.
Wed'mōre, Treaty of, 74.
Wei-hai-wei, 690.
Wellesley, Sir Arthur. See *Wellington.*
Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, Duke of, in Portugal, 564; at Waterloo, 578.
Wentworth, Thomas. See *Strafford.*
Weser (vā'zer), river, 392.
Wesley, Charles, 487.
Wesley, John, 487.
Western Empire (Teutonic). See *Charlemagne* and *Holy Roman Empire.*
Westphalia, kingdom of, 560; Peace of, 391–393.
Whigs, representatives of Liberalism, 602.
Whitby, Council of, 18, 19.
Whitefield (hwit'fēld), George, 487.
Wieland (vē'länt), 565.
Wilberforce, William, 493.
Wilhelmina, of Bayreuth, on Peter the Great, 459 n. 3.
William I, the Conqueror, king of England, his youth, 103; prepares to invade England, 104; victory at Hastings, 104; his reign, 105–108; II, the Red, 108; III, 449, 450–453.
William I, the Silent, stadtholder, mentioned, 366; his character, 367, 368; his "Apology," 371; his death, 372; II, 434 n. 13; III, 448; king of England, 449, 450–453.
William I, German Emperor, as king of Prussia, 639, 640, 644; Emperor, 646; death, 648; II, 648, 649.
Wimpheling, Jacob, 297 n. 1.
Windmills, introduced into Europe by Crusades, 144.
Win'frid, apostle of Germany, 20, 30.
Wink'el-ried, Arnold of, 239 n. 20.
Wisby (wĭz'bĭ), 174.
Wit'an, the, 103 n. 1; becomes the English Parliament, 109.
Wĭt''e-nä-gĕ'-mōt'. See *Witan.*
Wittenberg, Luther at, 306.
Wō'den, German god, 16.
Wolfe, James, 490.
Wolsey, Cardinal, minister of Henry VIII, 337, 338; death, 340.
Worcester, battle of, 436.
Workshops, national, in France, 592 n. 2.
Worms (vōrms), Concordat of, 119; Diet of, 304, 305.
Wren, Sir Christopher, 445 n. 15.
Würtemberg (vürt'tem-berg), kingdom of, 556; in German Empire, 646.
Wycliffe (wĭk'lĭf), John, 218, 219.

Xavier (zav'i-êr), Francis, 314.
Xeres (hā'rĕs'), battle of, 54.

Yezd, city, 53 n. 7.
York, House of, 199 n. 1. See *Roses, Wars of the.*
Yuste (yōōs'tā), 325.

Zaandam (zän-däm'), 460.
Zambesi (zam-bē'zē), river, 676.
Zend-Avesta, the, 52.
Zollverein (tsōl'fer-īn''), 637.
Zorn'dorf (tsorn'dorf), battle of, 474.
Zwingli (zwing'lē), Huldreich, 309.
Zwinglians, 309.

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER

CHAPTER XLV

THE WORLD WAR (1914–1918)

I. Causes of the War and Train of Preceding Events

763. The War's Place in History. — In the last days of July and the early days of August, 1914, — henceforth one of the memorable dates of history, — there broke out in Europe a war which at once involved five of the great powers of that continent and ultimately almost the whole of the civilized world. Before passing to an investigation of the fundamental causes of this titanic conflict, we must first note carefully its relation to the tendencies and world-wide movements which we have traced in the foregoing pages.

The events of this great war will appear in their right perspective and its place in history will be revealed only when it is viewed as the culmination of the Political Revolution which began in the seventeenth century in England and of which the outstanding fact before this upheaval of 1914 was the French Revolution.

As we have seen, one of the great principles proclaimed by the Revolution was the principle of popular sovereignty, of government by the people.[1]

Another of the influential ideas promulgated by the revolutionists of 1789 was the doctrine of nationality. This demands that every nation, that is, every considerable group whose members are kindred in blood or who have the same traditions, ideals, and aspirations, shall be free to live its own life, to be master of its own destiny. The principle forbids that one race should rule over another race.

Now, these principles of the Revolution are, as we shall see, the essential principles for which the nations that fought against a

[1] See sec. 644.

Prussianized Germany and her allies in the World War contended. This fact determines the place in history of the great conflict. It is the latest act — and, if the aims, purposes, and ideals of the nations that fought against Germany and her allies are ultimately attained, as it appears that they will be, we may hope the final act — in the drama of what we have called the Political Revolution.

764. Autocracy versus Democracy. — The place in history which we assign to the World War will be seen to be its real place if we look more closely, as we shall now proceed to do, at some of the underlying causes of the great conflict.

During the nineteenth century the revolutionary idea of government by the people made conquest, as we have seen, of a great part of Europe. Unhappily there were in Central Europe two states, Prussia and Austria, which repudiated the liberal principles of the Revolution and, under the mask of parliamentary forms, remained the upholders of the old discredited régime of autocratic government. Of these two states Prussia, under the House of Hohenzollern, was by far the most important and representative. It alone claims our attention here. In an earlier chapter we saw how the royal House of Hohenzollern was raised by Prince Bismarck, through a policy of "blood and iron," at once to the headship of Germany and the Imperial dignity.[2] We also saw how the young Emperor William II, the third of the Hohenzollerns to wear the Imperial crown, shortly after the beginning of his reign, abruptly dismissed the Imperial Chancellor, Prince Bismarck, and then began a very personal rule. The following utterances of the Emperor will reveal the spirit and temper of his government: "I alone am master here; who opposes me I shall crush" (a sentiment expressed by the young Emperor at the time he "dropped his pilot," Prince Bismarck). "We Hohenzollerns take our crown from God alone, and to God alone we are responsible in the fulfillment of duty."[3] "The spirit of the Lord has descended upon me because

[2] See Chapter XL.

[3] This was not merely Emperor William's personal interpretation of the German Constitution. The eminent German historian Eduard Meyer has said, "The power of Germany's monarchs must be unlimited, and they cannot therefore be responsible to man but to God alone."

I am the Emperor of the Germans. I am the instrument of the Almighty, his sword, his agent. Woe and death to all those who oppose my will." [4]

This is exactly the language of the divine-right Stuarts of England and the pre-revolutionary Bourbons of France, whose impious assumptions and cruel tyranny did so much to provoke the English and the French Revolution.[5] The ideal of government and the mode of thinking shown by these declarations was one of the deeper causes of the World War — for civilization cannot exist half autocratic and half democratic — and was what made it possible for President Wilson, when, in the third year of the unprecedented conflict, the United States entered the war, to define it as fundamentally a struggle between democracy and autocracy and to declare our aim and purpose in entering the war to be "to make the world safe for democracy." [6] In doing this we were but carrying on to completion our part of the work so far advanced by the men of 1789.

765. **Imperialism versus Nationalism.** — Again, the relation of the World War to the Revolution of 1789 is revealed in the part which violations of the second great principle of the revolutionists, namely, the principle of nationality, played in precipitating the great catastrophe of 1914 and in giving such complexity and world-wide range to the struggle. The most far-reaching in its consequences of these violations of the sentiment of nationalism was the tearing away from France of Alsace-Lorraine by the victorious Germans at the end of the Franco-Prussian War (sec. 714). During the forty years between the close of that war and the outbreak of the later conflict the German rule in these provinces was harsh and tactless. The freedom of the press was denied, the use of the French language was restricted, and every effort was made

[4] Proclamation by the Emperor to the army of the East at the beginning of the World War.

[5] Cf. secs. 440 and 458.

[6] That this was the real character of the war was at first obscured by the fact that autocratic Russia was an ally of the liberal governments of Western Europe; but when, in 1917, the Románov dynasty was overthrown and Russia proclaimed a republic, the real issues involved became clear.

to Germanize the people and lead them to forget France. As a result the provinces were in a chronic state of unrest and protest. Thousands of the young men fled the country and joined the French army.

All this tended to keep alive in France the deep feeling of resentment towards Germany for the great wrong of 1871. So potent a factor were the feelings nourished by this bitter root — combined with the fear of further mutilation — in bringing on the disaster of 1914 that it is not too much to say that when Bismarck permitted Alsace-Lorraine to be taken from France he sowed the seeds of a new war between Germany and France. This dismemberment of France was the direct and primary cause of the alignment of the great powers of Europe in two opposing alliances[7] and of that constant growth of armaments which made all Europe for more than a generation before 1914 an armed camp.

Aside from Alsace-Lorraine there were in Europe and Asian Turkey various nations and fragments of nations which at an earlier time, through the fortunes of war or the crimes of kings, had lost their independence and were being held in hated and oppressive subjection by alien races. Every one of these nations or parts of nations, — Poles, Rumanians, Slavs, Greeks, Italians, Armenians, and Arabs, — of which we shall speak later, became either an active cause in bringing on the World War or in widening its range and adding to its manifold phases and problems.

766. German Ideas and Doctrines. — We have seen how profound an influence philosophic ideas exerted upon the development and course of the French Revolution (sec. 558). Even more determinative in inaugurating and giving character to the great war of 1914 were the pernicious doctrines inculcated by the German ruling class and leaders in German thought. Among these ideas was the conception that the German people are a superior race ordained to world dominion. This idea of an elect race has played a great rôle in history. The ancient Hebrews, the Greeks, the Romans, each thought of themselves as a chosen people. But these were primitive peoples of the early world. It

[7] See secs. 715 and 769.

was not thought that this naïve notion could find a place in the sober thoughts and reasoned convictions of a civilized people of to-day. But, somehow, during the decades following the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 and the establishment of Prussian ascendancy in the Empire, it did become a fixed element in the German stock of ideas. What made this notion of German superiority in race and culture a menace to the security and peace of the world was that those entertaining this idea conceived it to be the mission of the German people to spread the superior German *Kultur* over the earth by force of arms if necessary, and thus to make Germany the "mother country of the future civilization of the world."

Another dangerous German teaching was that war is a necessary and divinely ordained factor in human history. "War," said the militarist Bernhardi, "is not only a biological law but a moral obligation, and as such an indispensable factor in civilization." "War," said Marshal von Moltke, "is an element of the order of the world established by God. . . . Without war the world would stagnate and lose itself in materialism." It was this philosophy of war which, blinding the German people to the insanity and criminality of aggressive war, had much to do in letting loose upon the world the immeasureable calamity of the war of 1914.

Still another sinister doctrine taught by many German philosophers is that the state in its relation to other states is not bound by the rules of morality. "Right and wrong," says an eminent German authority, "are notions needed in civil life only." "It will always conduce to the glory of Machiavelli," said the famous Treitschke, professor of history at the University of Berlin, at whose feet multitudes of German youth for many years received instruction in history and imbibed ideas of public morality, ". . . that he has freed the state and its morality from the precepts of the Church."[8] This means that war may be waged without regard to treaties or international law, without sentiment, pity, or mercy. "For the sake of the Fatherland," declared Professor Treitschke, "the natural sentiment of humanity is to be suppressed." Translated into practice in the World War by the

[8] See sec. 270.

German militarists, this monstrous doctrine that war may be waged without regard to the restraints of law and conscience produced the German policy of ruthlessness and frightfulness which, more than any other one thing, aroused and arrayed against the German government the greater part of the civilized world.

Having now indicated some of the root causes of the great war, and drawn attention to some German ideas and teachings which were at the bottom of the lawless and inhuman methods of the German military authorities in the conduct of the war, we will in the following pages trace the course of events that during the early years of the twentieth century mark the drift of Europe towards the abyss of the great catastrophe.

767. The Berlin-to-Bagdad Railway. — As has already been seen, by the end of the nineteenth century and before Germany was ready to enter the field as a competitor for colonies and for industrial opportunities outside of Europe, the other leading European nations, which had earlier achieved national unity, had acquired and partitioned among themselves the most of the desirable lands of the world open to European colonization or business enterprises.[9] There were left, however, three states — Turkey, Persia, and Morocco —which because of their backward or decadent condition were looked upon by the great industrial nations of Europe as inviting fields for economic exploitation and perhaps ultimately for actual political control.

Of these three states Turkey first drew the attention of the Germans. Early in the twentieth century Germany secured concessions from the Ottoman Porte for the construction of a railway across Asia Minor and Mesopotamia to Bagdad, and thence to some point on the Persian Gulf. In connection with lines in Europe this road was to give rail communication between Berlin and Bagdad, and hence is generally known as the Berlin-to-Bagdad Railway.

The purposes of this road were twofold: (1) to open up to German trade and business enterprise Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, lands of vast natural resources, which had nourished the great civilizations of the early world; and (2) to make it possible

[9] See Chapter XLIII.

for Germany in the event of war to menace British interests in Egypt and India. In time the political and military aims of the project came to take precedence of the purely economic purposes.

The Berlin-to-Bagdad Railway project affords an explanation of the unnatural alliance between Germany and Turkey, an alliance which became an important factor in the World War. The realization of the scheme required, of course, the friendly coöperation of the Turkish government and the good will of the Mohammedan world. In 1898 Emperor William II undertook a pious pilgrimage to Palestine. In a famous address made at Damascus he said: "May his Majesty the Sultan, as well as the three hundred million Moslems who venerate him as their Khalif, be assured that the German Emperor is their friend forever." Thus were the Mohammedans of Egypt, India, Central Asia, and North Africa, restless perhaps under British or Russian or French rule, told to whom they should look as a friend and deliverer.

The location of the Asian stretch of the Berlin-to-Bagdad Railway should be carefully noted. It follows closely the ancient military and trade route between the East and the West. Control of this highway gives control of Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. It is this which made the German project a matter of such international concern and rendered it such a factor in bringing on this world conflict and in extending the operations of the war into Mesopotamia and Palestine.

Great Britain was especially concerned. Alarmed at the prospect of Germany's getting a foothold at the head of the Persian Gulf, within striking distance of her sea route to India, she at first threw obstacles in the way of the carrying out of the project. The matter, however, was finally adjusted, and Great Britain gave up her opposition to the German enterprise; but the long-continued friction between the two governments had engendered mutual suspicions and animosities, which, deepened by later conflicts of interests, formed one of the contributing causes of the World War. As the war progressed, the important relation of the Berlin-to-Bagdad Railway to the German scheme for world dominion became more and more clearly revealed.

768. Germany becomes a Sea Power. — Before the close of the nineteenth century Germany, already possessing a dangerous military power, turned her attention toward the sea. The kaiser declared: "Our future lies on the water. . . . The trident must pass into our hands." A great German merchant marine was created, and a vast and lucrative overseas trade developed. In the making, the carrying, and the selling of goods the Germans came into successful competition with the English exporters and traders in all parts of the world. To protect her extended commerce in the event of war and to further her ambitious world policy, Germany began the creation of a navy. At the opening of the twentieth century her war fleet was second only to that of Great Britain.[10] The British government became alarmed. The insular security of Great Britain seemed to be menaced, for, with only a small army, she must hold command of the seas to be safe. A keen competition between the two nations in the construction of warships began. In this rivalry there was a distinct menace to world peace.

769. The Triple Entente, or Good Understanding, between Great Britain, France, and Russia. — Germany's constant increase of her navy, and her ambition for world domination as disclosed by the utterances of the German militarists and ruling classes, deepened the fears of Great Britain and caused her to abandon her policy of keeping aloof, in "splendid isolation," from continental alliances, and to enter into what was in effect, though not in name, a defensive alliance with France and Russia. In 1904 she settled all her long-standing troubles with France and reached a cordial understanding with her. This arrangement was a matter of world-wide importance, for though it was purely a measure of defense against the German menace, Germany claimed it was evidence of unfriendly intentions and a plot for her "encirclement" and destruction. Henceforth her hatred of Great Britain became ever more fixed and implacable.

Three years after Great Britain had reached her good understanding with France, she effected with Russia an adjustment of all their conflicting interests in Asia and elsewhere. One of the

[10] The Kiel Canal was opened in 1895.

most important of the disputes settled was that concerning Persia, the second of the "decadent" states already mentioned. A revolution here having resulted in a condition of anarchy which seemed to justify outside intervention, Great Britain and Russia proceeded to partition the country, Russia taking as her special sphere of influence the northern provinces and Great Britain the southwest region. Both governments mutually agreed to respect the "integrity" and "independence" of Persia.

This accord between these two ancient rivals was a matter of tremendous import in world history, of even greater import than the French and British accord. Great Britain now gave up all opposition to Russia's ambition to secure control of the waterways of the Bosporus and Dardanelles. It was Germany now, with her ambitious projects in Asian Turkey and her Bagdad Railway, that had become a menace to British possessions in both Egypt and India. Great Britain's earlier opposition to Russian purposes was now directed against German plans of expansion eastward.

These settlements and arrangements completed what is known as the Triple Entente, or good understanding, between Great Britain, France, and Russia.[11] The six great powers[12] were now aligned in two groups, the members of each group so bound together by alliances or understandings that a conflict arising between any two states of the opposing groups was almost certain to bring on a general European war. So this very expedient — the forming of alliances — whereby the European governments sought to maintain the balance of power and to preserve the peace of the world was the very thing that made so extended and so colossal the disaster that overwhelmed Europe in 1914.

770. The First Moroccan Crisis (1905). — Morocco, the third of the "decadent" states that seemed marked out for commercial penetration or political absorption by their more vigorous and enterprising neighbors, simultaneously with the formation of the Triple

[11] France and Russia had drawn together and formed in 1891 a defensive alliance known as the Dual Alliance.

[12] The Triple Alliance, it will be recalled, embraced Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy.

Entente became the subject of a serious international controversy. The collision of interests here was between Germany on the one hand and France and Great Britain on the other. France had set her heart on the possession of this country in order to round out her African empire.[13] When, in 1904, Great Britain and France entered into a mutual good understanding, this was one of the things settled. An agreement was reached whereby France gave Great Britain a free hand in Egypt in return for a free hand for herself in Morocco.

The next year the German Emperor landed in his yacht, the *Hohenzollern*, at the Moroccan port of Tangier and made addresses to the German traders and merchants there which were meant for other ears besides theirs. His utterances were notice to Great Britain and France that in all arrangements and conventions respecting the remaining free states of the world Germany must be consulted. This was merely a reaffirmation of a previous declaration that nothing of importance in the world at large should be arranged without the consent of Germany and the German Emperor.

France, — though she felt that Germany's intervention was unjustifiable, — being uncertain of the armed support of Great Britain and knowing that her other ally, Russia, because of the defeat she had just suffered at the hands of Japan (sec. 753) was powerless to help her, made humiliating concessions to Germany[14] and agreed to the calling of an international convention to review the whole matter. The outcome of this meeting[15] was favorable for France ; the representatives of the nations recognized her special and superior interest in Morocco and commissioned her to maintain order in that country.

This Moroccan affair is a landmark in history, one of the outstanding facts of the decade preceding the outbreak of the great war. The crisis created by Germany's manner of intervention had,

[13] See sec. 738 and map after page 668.

[14] The French Premier, Delcassé, who had carried on the negotiations with the British government, was by Germany's threat of war forced to resign.

[15] The Convention of Algeciras, 1906.

it is true, been passed safely, but important consequences resulted from her action. The good understanding between Great Britain, France, and Russia was cemented. It now became something like a real alliance. On the other hand, Germany's prestige had received a severe blow, and this caused her hatred of Great Britain, which had taken the side of France in the international convention, to become more intense and bitter.

771. Some Factors of the Balkan Problem. — Our attention is now directed to southeastern Europe, where was laid the train which was to start the frightful conflagration of the World War. The situation here at the opening of the twentieth century was bewildering in the variety of the motives, interests, and aspirations of the peoples and governments concerned, but it will become in a measure intelligible if we bear in mind the following dominant facts:

First, the situation was one which concerned the relations to Turkey of the several small Balkan states. The Turkish provinces adjoining these little states contained more than two million Christian Greeks, Bulgarians, and Serbians who longed for liberation from Ottoman oppression and for union with their emancipated brethren. Racial and religious antagonisms among the Christians themselves, especially in Macedonia, aggravated the disorder and wretchedness.

Second, the situation was one which concerned more or less closely several of the great powers. Russia's old ambition to control the waterways leading from the Black Sea to the Ægean was not only still active but was now more urgent than ever before, because her defeat by Japan had denied her a warm-water port on the Pacific. Great Britain no longer barred her way, but Germany was now interested in keeping these waterways out of her hands, since the Muscovite seated on the Bosporus would imperil German interests in Asia Minor and defeat the great German project of a Berlin-to-Bagdad Railway.

Then the ambition of the Slav state of Serbia to unite all the people of Serbian race in a Greater Serbia, with outlets on the Adriatic and the Ægean, was a menace to the integrity of Austria-Hungary, for the neighboring provinces of the monarchy were

largely Serbian in blood, in language, and in sympathies and would inevitably gravitate towards an enlarged and prosperous Serbia. In a word, Serbia was just such a present danger to Austria in the Balkans as Sardinia had been to her possessions in Northern Italy in the nineteenth century.[16] Just as Sardinia drew to herself the Italian subjects of Austria, so now Serbia threatened to draw to herself all the Serbian subjects of Austria-Hungary. Thus a Greater Serbia threatened the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Moreover, the establishment of a powerful Serbian state meant that Austria's coveted way to the Ægean would be barred; for after Austria's expulsion from Northern Italy, which had been for centuries the pathway of her Mediterranean trade, she had turned towards the East and had sought to secure an outlet across Macedonia to Saloniki on the Ægean.

Besides the several interests of Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary in the Balkan problem, still another of the great powers, Italy, was deeply concerned. Italy desired possession of *Italia irredenta*, "unredeemed Italy," which embraced lands on her northern Alpine frontier and about the head of the Adriatic, of which the population was largely Italian, but which were held by Austria just as once she held Lombardy and Venetia. Furthermore, Italy was watchful to see that, with the Turks driven out of Europe, Austria should not appropriate Albania as her part of the booty and thus get possession of the eastern shore of the Adriatic and make of that sea an Austrian lake.

These mutual jealousies, rival ambitions, and conflicting interests of the great powers created the Balkan problem in so far as it was an international question concerning Europe at large.

772. The Young Turks; the Turkish Revolution (1908). — The situation in the Balkans being such as is portrayed in the preceding section, a remarkable movement in the Turkish Empire became the prelude to events of world import. In 1908 a revolution inaugurated by a party calling themselves Young Turks broke out in European Turkey. The leaders of this movement were men many of whom had been educated in Western Europe and had

[16] Cf. secs. 690–696.

there become imbued with the spirit of modern liberalism. Gaining control of the Balkan army, they demanded and secured from the Sultan Abdul Hamid a constitution[17] which created a parliament and gave to all the subjects of the Sultan equal civic rights and complete religious liberty. The news of the granting of a constitution was received by the subjects of the Sultan first with utter incredulity, and then, when the news was confirmed, with unparalleled demonstrations of joy. The world looked on with amazed and sympathetic interest. To the first Turkish parliament which convened under the constitution the American Congress sent good wishes and congratulations, while the leading members of the British House of Commons sent an address headed, "From the Oldest of Parliaments to the Youngest."

For a few years the Young Turks administered affairs with such a measure of success as to awaken high hopes everywhere that the regeneration of Turkey was now really to be effected and the eternal Eastern Question thus given a final solution. But unfortunately there was a lack of capable leaders in the party of reform. The promise of equal rights to all was not kept. The Young Turks could not give up their position as the dominant and privileged race of the empire. They set about the forcible "Turkification" of all the non-Turkish peoples — the Greeks, the Armenians, the Albanians, the Bulgarians, and the Arabs — of the Ottoman dominions. Meanwhile the treacherous Abdul Hamid broke faith with the revolutionists and worked secretly to get rid of the constitution and to regain his despotic power.[18]

773. The Bosnian Crisis (1908). — But an even more serious obstacle in the way of the success of the reform movement than these internal weaknesses and dissensions was the sordid greed of several of the great powers, who saw in a regenerated Turkey the ruin of all their hopes of ultimately inheriting coveted portions of the "sick man's" estate. His recovery was the very last thing

[17] This was a revival of a constitution that had been granted in 1876 and later revoked.

[18] Abdul Hamid, after having instituted atrocious massacres of the Christians at Adana and other places in Asian Turkey, was deposed in 1909 and his brother Mohammed V placed on the throne. In 1918 he was succeeded by Mohammed VI.

they desired. Austria, fearing that if the Young Turks succeeded in establishing a reformed and strong government she would lose control of Bosnia and Herzegovina, of which Turkish provinces she had been made administrator by the Treaty of Berlin, annexed the provinces to the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (1908). This was a gross violation of the terms of the Berlin treaty and the direct beginning of the great tragedy of 1914.

Serbia, which had hoped that the provinces, their population being largely Serbian in race and language, would fall to her on the passing of the "sick man," felt grievously injured by Austria's act, and made vigorous protest, but unavailingly; for when Russia and Great Britain also protested, Emperor William took his stand, in "shining armor,"[19] by the side of Austria and upheld her in her wrongful procedure. Neither Russia nor any other of the great powers being ready to risk precipitating a general European war through intervention by force of arms, the provinces remained in Austria's hands. Another great crisis had been passed, but not without Europe's being drawn nearer to the abyss. By a gesture of the "mailed fist" Emperor William had settled to his own and his ally's advantage a matter of European concern. But there was danger in settling matters of that kind in such a manner.

774. The Second Moroccan Crisis (1911). — We have seen how at the time of the first Moroccan crisis France was commissioned by the powers to preserve order in the country. Unfortunately the native government was inefficient and corrupt, hence the inevitable happened. The country fell into anarchy. A French army was soon at the capital Fez, and one of the rival contestants for the crown placed himself under French protection. This meant, of course, that Morocco's existence as an independent state was ended.[20]

At once a German warship, the *Panther*, appeared at one of the country's ports,[21] and the German Emperor asked France what compensation she would allow Germany in return for a free hand

[19] A phrase used by the Kaiser in a later speech.
[20] The country became a French protectorate in 1912.
[21] Agadir, 1911.

in Morocco. After long and heated "conversations" — Great Britain with her navy ready for action supporting France, since she could not permit Germany to secure a foothold on the shore opposite Gibraltar — the Emperor consented to the establishment by France of a protectorate over Morocco in return for the cession to Germany of portions of the French possessions in tropical Africa.

Thus by threat of war Germany had secured a "place in the sun" in Africa, but her relations with France had been greatly embittered, for the French denounced her action as blackmail, holding that German interests in Morocco were not of a nature to justify the intervention of Germany in the matter.

Furthermore, the relations of Germany and Great Britain had been rendered still more tense, for many Germans were dissatisfied with the settlement and felt that had it not been for the support which the British government gave France, Germany might have secured larger concessions from her — perhaps have got a part of Morocco itself.

775. The Balkan Wars (1912–1913). — The example set by Austria in 1908 in the seizure of the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina was shortly followed by Italy.[22] A regenerated Turkey threatened to make an end of the long-cherished hope of the Italians that Tripoli and Cyrenaica in North Africa would fall to them as ripened fruit on the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. So the Italian government resolved to seize at once the coveted prize, justifying this action on the ground that the Young Turks were treating unfairly Italian settlers and traders in the country. An expedition was launched, and the provinces were seized and annexed to Italy (1911).

The Austrian and Italian attacks upon the integrity of the Ottoman Empire naturally excited the small Balkan states and helped to bring them to an epoch-making decision. Bulgaria, Serbia, Montenegro, and Greece formed an alliance (the Balkan League),

[22] Other states had earlier followed her example. Two days after Austria had announced her decision to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria proclaimed her complete independence from the suzerainty of the Ottoman Porte. Straightway the island of Crete, still under nominal Turkish suzerainty, declared for union with Greece (1908). Crete's union with Greece was sanctioned by the Treaty of London, 1913.

the aim of which was to make an end of the Turkish power in Europe. The adventure turned out beyond all expectation. To the amazement of the world the armies of the little states in a few weeks drove the Turks from almost all their possessions on the European continent — thus accomplishing what the great powers, because of their mutual jealousies, had been unable in centuries of war and diplomacy to effect.

The marvelous success of the allies put into their hands much greater spoils in the way of territory than they had expected, and all probably would have gone well in the distribution of these had it not been for the intervention of the great powers, the interests of more than one of which were menaced by the proposed settlement. Austria, supported by Italy, demanded that no part of Albania should be allowed to go to Serbia, but that this territory should be made into an independent state. This was to keep Serbia from the Adriatic. Thus pushed back from her coveted outlet on these waters, Serbia turned towards the Ægean. She asked Bulgaria to consent to a revision of the original agreement regarding the division of the lands wrested from the Turks, and permit her to retain possession of a part of Macedonia. Bulgaria refused and insisted upon a division of the conquered lands in accordance with the terms of the original agreement. The Tsar of Russia in vain begged the disputants to submit the matter to him as arbiter. Instead of doing this Bulgaria suddenly attacked Serbia, being incited to this act, there is reason to believe, by Austria, and thus precipitated the Second Balkan War. In this lamentable struggle Serbia, Montenegro, Greece, and Rumania were united against Bulgaria. The Turks seized the opportunity to retake a portion of the territory wrested from them in the first war. Beset on every side, Bulgaria was soon forced to give over the struggle. By the Treaty of Bûcharest there was made a new map of the Balkans. All that we need note here is the territorial aggrandizement of Slavic Serbia. This meant, of course, the enhancement of Russian influence in the Balkans, since racial sentiment and sympathies would naturally cause Serbia to draw towards the great mother Slav state.

On the other hand, a Greater Serbia was a menace to Austria, for a powerful Serbia would not only block her way to the Ægean but would naturally draw away or make more restless Austria's subjects of Serbian race, thereby tending to hasten the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

Furthermore, an enlarged and powerful Serbia under Russian influence and protection was something that the German Emperor could not brook, since it lay across the Berlin-to-Bagdad Railway and was a menace to that project and thus to the whole Pan-German scheme for the commercial and political domination of Western Asia.

776. Assassination of the Crown Prince of Austria; Austria's Ultimatum to Serbia. — It was inevitable that, in the circumstances which we have described, Austro-Serbian relations should become strained to a dangerous tension. Events moved rapidly. While visiting the recently annexed province of Bosnia, the Austrian crown prince — the Archduke Francis Ferdinand — and his wife were assassinated.[23] Austria, charging that Serbian officials were accomplices of the assassins, addressed to Serbia an ultimatum,[24] some of the demands of which were incompatible with the rights of Serbia as a sovereign and independent state. An answer was demanded in forty-eight hours. Serbia returned a conciliatory reply, acceding to most of the demands and offering to submit either to the International Tribunal at the Hague or to the judgment of certain of the great powers the points to which she could not give unqualified assent. The reply was pronounced unacceptable, and Austria, supported in her course by Germany, declared war against Serbia.[25]

The action of Austria created alarm in every European capital. Strenuous efforts were made by Great Britain, France, and Russia to stay Austria's hand and to have the whole question brought before a conference of the great powers not directly interested or carried to the Hague Tribunal, for nothing was more certain than that an attack by Austria upon Serbia would precipitate a general European war, because Russia would not and could not stand

[23] At Sarajevo, June 28, 1914. [24] July 23, 1914. [25] July 28.

aloof and see the little Serbian nation crushed, since this would mean German supremacy in the Balkans. But Germany, rejecting all proposals, insisted that the matter concerned Austria and Serbia alone and that there should be no intervention by any of the other powers.

Austria having actually attacked Serbia, Russia began to mobilize her armies against the Dual Monarchy. Germany thereupon sent an ultimatum to Russia demanding that she demobilize within twelve hours. Russia giving no response, Germany declared war against her.[26]

At the same time Germany asked the French Premier, Viviani, whether in the event of a Russo-German war France would remain neutral. His reply was that "France would take such action as her interests might require." Almost immediately the German troops crossed the French frontier.[27] On August 2 Germany presented an ultimatum to Belgium, declaring it to be her purpose to march across Belgian territory to attack France and promising, if the passage of the German troops was not opposed, to guarantee, upon the conclusion of peace, the independence and integrity of the Belgian kingdom, but at the same time warning the Belgian government that if the advance of the German forces was impeded in any way, the German government would deal with Belgium as an enemy. The Belgian government, reminding Germany that she herself had solemnly promised to respect Belgian neutrality, refused to consent to the passage of the German army, saying that "by accepting the proposal she would sacrifice the honor of the Belgian nation while at the same time betraying her duties towards Europe." The German troops at once swept into Belgium.

The violation of Belgium brought Great Britain into the war.[28] On August 4 the British ambassador at Berlin received instructions to inform the Imperial German Government that if assurance

[26] August 1.

[27] Germany declared war on France Aug. 3.

[28] Though the invasion of Belgium by the Germans actually brought Great Britain into the war, it is certain that she would, as the ally of France, have taken part in it even if the neutrality of Belgium had not been violated. She could not have stood aside while Germany was striking down France, robbing her of her colonies, and making of her a vassal state.

was not given by twelve o'clock that night that the German advance into Belgium would be stopped, the British government would "take all steps in their power to uphold the neutrality of Belgium and the observance of a treaty to which Germany was as much a party as themselves." The German Chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg, greatly agitated, expressed pain and surprise that the British government should take such a resolve "just for a word, 'neutrality' — just for a scrap of paper."

The Imperial German Government's reply to the British ultimatum being that it was absolutely necessary that the German armies should advance into France "by the quickest and easiest way, so as to be able to get well ahead with their operations and endeavor to strike some decisive blow as early as possible," Great Britain at once drew the sword.

Thus by August 5, only fourteen days after Austria's ultimatum to Serbia, five of the great powers were at war. The curtain had lifted on "the most tragic drama of human history."

II. Outstanding Events of the War

777. The Violation of Belgium. — The German plan of campaign was simple. With a swift blow France was to be struck down before her allies could come to her aid; then Russia, whom Austria was to hold in check while the German armies were overrunning France, was to be put out of the war. But the French frontier toward Germany, running from Switzerland to Luxemburg, was strongly fortified, and the reduction of these defenses would delay for at least several weeks the advance into France of the German troops; hence the proposal made by Germany to the Belgian government for an unobstructed passage of the German armies through Belgium. We have seen how, upon the indignant rejection of this dishonorable proposal, the German troops were flung across the frontier in utter disregard of treaty obligations and of international law. The crime was confessed in self-indicting words by the German Chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg. In announcing to the Reichstag the invasion of Belgium, he said:

"Gentlemen, we are now in a state of necessity, and necessity knows no law. Our troops have occupied Luxemburg and perhaps are already on Belgian soil. Gentlemen, that is contrary to the dictates of international law. . . . The wrong — I speak openly — that we are committing we will endeavor to make good as soon as our military goal has been reached." [29]

The first obstacle to the advance of the German forces was the strongly fortified city of Liège. In a few days the defenses of the place, which had been thought impregnable, were pounded into dust by the monstrous siege guns of the enemy.

The resistance of the Belgians roused a fury of rage in the Germans, who now began a campaign of "frightfulness" (*Schrecklichkeit*), the purpose of which was to terrorize the people and make them submissive to the German will. Villages and cities, individual citizens of which it was alleged had fired upon the German soldiers, were sacked and burned, and hundreds of non-combatants — men, women, and children — were indiscriminately slain. Hostages were shot for the alleged acts of persons over whom they had no control. Priests were killed. The famous university and library of Louvain were wantonly destroyed and a large part of the city itself laid in ashes. The world stood aghast at these crimes, for it had been believed that the time was past when the armies of any civilized government would commit such atrocities, to which there is no parallel in history since the Thirty Years' War.

The brave resistance of the Belgians to the passage of the German armies had momentous consequences. The delay, short though it was, that it caused the Germans not only gave the French time to concentrate their forces and throw them to the north between the invaders and Paris but it also gave England time to come to the aid of her ally with a small but efficient force. It thus made possible the great victory of the Marne.

778. "The Miracle of the Marne" (Sept. 5–9, 1914). — Along the Franco-Belgian frontier the German invaders were met by the French and British armies. Their stubborn resistance to the

[29] This speech was made Aug. 4, 1914.

German advance, however, was broken, and the victorious Germans pushed on towards Paris. The French government fled to Bordeaux. It seemed as though the story of 1870 was to be repeated. But with the enemy almost within sight of the capital, the French general, Joffre, halted the retreat of his forces along the southern banks of the river Marne, and there, near the region where, more than fourteen hundred years before, the hordes of Attila were turned back by the Franks and their allies,[30] inflicted a memorable defeat upon the invaders. The Germans retreated to the river Aisne, nearly halfway to the Belgian frontier, and there intrenched themselves.

The battle of the Marne is rightly given a place — perhaps it should be the first place — among the decisive battles of the world. It saved not only France but all continental Europe from German domination, for nothing is more certain than that, if France had lost at the Marne, Russia would have been quickly overrun by the German armies and German military and political control of the Continent firmly established.

779. The Struggle for the Channel Ports. — The Germans had failed in their plans to reach Paris and put France out of the war. They now made a supreme effort to reach the sea and get control of the Channel ports on the shore opposite England. With these ports in the hands of the enemy the safety of England would, of course, have been imperiled. Strenuous efforts were made to prevent such a calamity. British, French, and Belgian forces were quickly thrown between the Germans and the coveted prize. These land forces were aided by the British fleet, which patrolled the coast. In the Flanders region the sluices were opened and wide tracts of the land flooded — an old device for defense in these low-lying lands. The struggle was long and bitter. Some of the bloodiest battles of the war were fought here.[31] The British army, "a contemptible little army," as it was characterized by the German kaiser, after deeds of valor which made of the epithet of

[30] See *Ancient History*, 2d Rev. ed., sec. 544.

[31] The most important were the battle of the Iser and the battle of Ypres. ("'Wipers' of the English Tommy deserves a place beside Waterloo and Blenheim in English history." — SIMONDS)

scorn a badge of immortal honor,[32] was virtually annihilated. Though the Germans reached the sea at Ostend and gained control of a strip of the Belgian coast, they were thwarted in reaching their main objective — the ports of Calais and Boulogne, at the narrowest part of the Channel.

780. The Western Battle Front. — After the battle of the Marne and at the end of the struggle for the Channel ports, the Germans, still standing in the main on French and Belgian soil, intrenched themselves along a line about four hundred and seventy miles in length, running from Switzerland to the North Sea. Facing the German trenches were drawn the trenches of the Allies. Never before in history was there such a far-flung battle line. Between the opposing lines of ditches, dugouts, and wire entanglements ran a strip of ground varying in width from a few yards in some places to several hundred yards in others, known as "No Man's Land" — a name which suggests much of the tragedy of the great war.

For about a year and a half the French, aided by a small number of British and Belgian troops, held back the German masses along this extended line, while a new British army, numbering several millions, was being raised, trained, and equipped; and then for another like period the Anglo-French-Belgian forces manned the trenches until the United States, which early in 1917 had entered the war, was mustering, drilling, and transporting to France a vast army.

During these three years the fighting along this Western front was in the nature of siege operations. Hundreds of cannon, large and small, were constantly pouring showers of shell into the trenches of the enemy, until in many places "No Man's Land" was so plowed up and so pitted with shell holes that a photograph of it from an airplane resembled a photograph of the crater-pitted face of the moon. Many offensives, or drives, were launched by both the Germans and the Allies in efforts to push back or break through the opposing line, but at the end of the three years the lines, though in some places they had been bent

[32] The survivors of this expeditionary army proudly accept the title of "The Contemptibles."

and pushed towards Germany, in general ran substantially as at the beginning of the period.

The story of this trench warfare on the Western front belongs to the military records of the war and cannot be dwelt upon here. We shall merely, a little later, preserving the chronological order of our narrative, speak briefly of one of the offensives undertaken by the Germans and mention others launched by the Allies, which were such supreme efforts as to make them of epochal importance.[33]

781. The Eastern Front; Russian Victories and Reverses (1914–1915). — We must now turn our attention to the Eastern front. Just at the moment when the Germans were threatening Paris, the Russians came to the aid of their French ally by sending two armies into East Prussia and menacing Berlin. One of the invading armies was met and almost annihilated by the German general, Hindenburg.[34] The other army then drew back to the frontier.

This defeat of the Russians in East Prussia was offset by their victories over Austria in Galicia.[35] Three great Austrian armies were routed and three hundred thousand prisoners taken. The military power of Austria seemed on the point of absolute collapse. But with the coming of Germany to the rescue of her ally, the tide was quickly turned. A great victory for the Central Powers[36] saved Austria and crippled seriously the military power of Russia. A wide strip of Western Russia, including Poland, fell into the hands of the Germans. As earlier in the west so now here in the east there resulted a deadlock, and the contending armies settled down to trench warfare.

Thus Germany at the end of campaigns covering about a year and a half had failed as to her main purpose both in the west and in the east.[37] Neither France nor Russia, though each had received a terrible blow and lost much territory, had been put out of the war.

[33] See sec. 785 and n. 45.

[34] At the battle of Tannenberg, Aug. 31, 1914.

[35] Lemberg was taken by the Russians about September 1, 1914; Przemysl fell into their hands in early March, 1915, with 125,000 prisoners.

[36] The battle of the Dunajec, early May, 1915, as decisive a victory for Germany as the battle of the Marne was for France.

[37] She was more successful in the southeast (see sec. 784).

782. The Sinking of the *Lusitania* (May 7, 1915). — On February 4, 1915, the German government announced that every merchant vessel of the Allies entering a designated zone around the British Isles would be destroyed, "without its being always possible to avert the dangers threatening the crews and passengers." This meant that such vessels would be sunk without warning.

Now, to do the thing the German government announced it was going to do would be not only to violate the principles of humanity but to disregard the law of nations, which forbids the destruction of passenger or merchant ships under any circumstances before the crews and passengers have been put in a place of safety.

Notwithstanding a solemn warning from President Wilson that the United States government would hold the German government to a "strict accountability" if such action as it purposed to take should result in the death of any American citizens, the German submarines straightway proceeded to sink merchant vessels without warning, and in several instances destroyed the lives of American citizens. Then on May 1, 1915, there appeared in American newspapers an advertisement issued by the German Embassy in Washington, in which all persons were warned against taking passage on the British steamship *Lusitania*, which was about to sail from New York for an English port, it being intimated that every effort would be made by German submarines to sink the liner. No attention was paid to the warning, as no one believed that any government would do the thing that the Imperial German Government threatened to do.

On the evening of May 7, 1915, as the *Lusitania*, with crew and passengers numbering about two thousand, neared the Irish coast, she was torpedoed without warning, and more than a thousand persons, among them many women and little children, were drowned.

This awful crime created horror and indignation throughout the civilized world. The United States government demanded of the German government a disavowal of the act and assurance that the operations of its submarines would in the future conform to the requirements of international law. But it was only after a long

delay and the exchange of numerous notes that the German government finally gave the following pledge: "Liners will not be sunk by our submarines without warning and without providing for the safety of the lives of non-combatants, provided that the liners do not try to escape or offer resistance."[38]

It was the breaking of this solemn pledge by the Imperial German Government that, as we shall learn, was the immediate cause of the United States, early in 1917, entering the war on the side of the Allies.

783. Italy enters the War (May 23, 1915). — Although a member of the Triple Alliance, Italy did not join Germany and Austria in the war, because she was convinced that the war against Serbia was an act of aggression on the part of Austria, and since the alliance of which she was a member was merely a defensive, and not an offensive, alliance, she was not bound to come to the aid of her allies.

In truth Italy's alliance with Austria was an altogether unnatural one, for Austria was the hereditary enemy of the Italian people.[39] Instead of fighting for the extension of Austrian rule and the enhancement of Austria's influence and power in the Balkans, the Italians were rather minded to take advantage of her embarrassment and fight for the liberation of the still unredeemed Italian lands[40] (*Italia irredenta*). Negotiations were begun by the Italian government with Austria for her withdrawal from these districts. But no agreement could be reached, and Italy entered the war on the side of the Allies. A new battle front was thus created. For the next two years and more this front was the scene of much hard mountain fighting, in which the Italian armies wrested from Austrian control much of the coveted lands.[41] Then came a great disaster, of which we shall speak later, and the loss by the Italians of all that had been gained, and much besides.

[38] This pledge was given Sept. 1, 1915. "A liner now means any vessel which sails for any commercial purpose with reasonable regularity and as a part of recognized commerce. Thus we speak of transatlantic liners and coastwise liners; of passenger liners and freight liners." — BECK, *The War and Humanity* (2d ed., 1917), p. 182. [39] See Chapter XXXIX. [40] The Trentino and Trieste.

[41] Embracing the important city of Gorizia, which was taken Aug. 8, 1916.

784. The War in the Southeast in 1915; Serbia and Turkey. — We have noted how the close of the year 1915 saw Germany's main war aims both in the west and in the east unattained (sec. 781). In the southeast, however, by the end of the year Germany had completely realized her plans. What she wanted here was to secure Austro-German supremacy in the Balkans and to keep unobstructed her railway route to the Persian Gulf. All this she achieved in a terrible drive against Serbia and through aiding Turkey in the defense of the Dardanelles.

The Serbian situation at the beginning of this offensive was as follows: At the opening of the war in 1914 Austria had invaded Serbia and taken the capital, Belgrade. After severe fighting the Serbians had retaken their capital and driven the Austrians from Serbian soil. Germany then came to the aid of her ally, and a strong Austro-German army in coöperation with a large Bulgarian force — Bulgaria having joined the Central Powers — quickly overcame all Serbian resistance.[42] The Serbian army, in one of the most distressful retreats in history, fled southward over the Albanian mountains, amidst the snows of a bitter winter, and the remnant who escaped capture or death from exposure found a refuge in the island of Corfu. Serbia was made a second Belgium. Montenegro, which fought with Serbia, was involved in Serbia's ruin.

There were still other misfortunes to deepen the gloom that darkened for the Allies the close of the year 1915. An attempt made early in the year by an Anglo-French fleet to reach Constantinople by forcing the Dardanelles[43] had ended in disaster. This failure of the fleet was followed by an equally ill-fated land attack,[44] in which Australian and New Zealand troops won special distinction. Before the end of the year the allied forces, having suffered great privation and heavy losses, were withdrawn.

[42] An Anglo-French army which had been gathered at the Greek port of Saloniki was outmatched and, hampered by the fear of Greek treachery in its rear, was unable to render the Serbians any effective aid.

[43] Turkey had entered the war in November, 1914, on the side of the Central Powers. Her action was motived, in part, by fear of her hereditary enemy, Russia, in the event of the triumph of the Allies.

[44] On the peninsula of Gallipoli.

Thus "for the moment Germany had realized the German dream of expansion to the Near East, the conception of a Central Empire, a Mittel-Europa, fronting the Baltic and the Adriatic, overflowing the Sea of Marmora into Asia Minor, and bound by the German-built railway uniting Berlin, Vienna, and Constantinople with Bagdad, and Hamburg and Antwerp with Suez and the Persian Gulf. Here at last was a solid gain, a real victory, after two great disappointments" (Simonds).

785. Verdun — "They shall not pass." — The event of greatest military importance in 1916, the third year of the war, was the German offensive — really a trench battle that lasted nearly a year — against Verdun, on the west front. Russia having been defeated and the German situation in the Balkans made secure, Germany now turned to strike another blow at France in the hope of breaking either the French line or the French spirit and thus putting France out of the war before Great Britain's new army was drilled, equipped, and in the field.

The blow was aimed at Verdun, an ancient French fortress. The attack began early in the year. The grim watchword of the French was, "They shall not pass." The Germans, after the first rush, made for several months only slow foot-by-foot advances; and then the French, taking the offensive, quickly drove them from practically all the ground which they had occupied. The losses of the Germans in killed, wounded, and prisoners are estimated to have exceeded a quarter of a million. This French victory was second only to that of the Marne.[45]

[45] At the same time that the Germans launched their great offensive at Verdun the Austrians made a menacing attack through the Trentino. To relieve the pressure on their allies, Russia and Great Britain started offensives. Russia, having recovered more quickly than was thought possible from her defeat in 1915, attacked Austria and took 400,000 prisoners. This forced the Austrians hastily to withdraw their troops from Italy for the defense of their eastern frontier. In Asia Minor the Grand Duke Nicholas, commander of the Russian forces in the Caucasus, set on foot a campaign against the Turks, overran Armenia, and captured the important cities of Erzerum and Trebizond.

The British, or rather Franco-British, drive is known as the battle of the Somme. This was one of the great battles of the war. The enemy's lines were so shaken that in the spring of 1917 the Germans were forced to retreat to what is known as the Hindenburg line. The territory given up was wantonly and ruthlessly devastated.

786. Rumania enters the War and is ruined. — Before the end of the year 1916 the fortunes of the Central Powers were at their lowest ebb. The German attempt to break the French front at Verdun had failed; the British and French had gained the great victory of the Somme;[46] Italy had repelled the Austrian invasion of the Trentino and had made important gains in the region between the Julian Alps and the sea. It seemed as though the ultimate defeat of the two empires was certain. At this critical moment Rumania entered the war,[47] making the seventh nation arrayed against the Central Powers. Her aim in throwing herself into the struggle was to realize national unity for the Rumanian race by the liberation from the Austro-Hungarian yoke of the several million Rumanians of Transylvania.

Rumania's action simply added another to the many tragedies of the great war. Betrayed by pro-German sympathizers among Russian officials, the little state was quickly crushed by the German armies and the greater part of its territory occupied.[48]

787. A German Peace Offer; President Wilson's Address to the Senate (Jan. 22, 1917). — The overshadowing events of the year 1917 were the Russian revolution, with its aftermath of the collapse of Russia, and the entrance into the war of the United States of America. But before proceeding to speak of these matters we must note certain discussions respecting terms of peace and the war aims of the belligerents which marked the close of the year 1916 and the opening of the year upon which we here enter.

These peace discussions were opened by the Central Powers. Adopting the tone of victors, they proposed a meeting for peace negotiations of all the nations at war. The Allies refused to enter into such a conference until Germany and Austria had stated the conditions upon which they were ready to conclude peace.

About the same time President Wilson, acting independently of the overtures of the Central Powers, asked all the nations at war to state "their respective views as to the terms upon which the war might be concluded, and the arrangements which would be

[46] See note 45. [47] Aug. 27, 1916.
[48] The campaign was not completed until 1917.

deemed satisfactory as a guarantee against its renewal or the kindling of any similar conflict in the future."

To this appeal the Central Powers made only a very brief reply, which contained no statement as to the terms on which they would be willing to conclude peace. The allied governments, however, replying at greater length, stated concretely the objects they sought in the war, declaring these to be "the restoration of Belgium, of Serbia, of Montenegro, and the indemnities which are due them; the evacuation of the invaded territories of France, of Russia, and of Rumania, with just reparation; . . . the restitution of provinces or territories wrested in the past from the Allies by force or against the will of their populations, the liberation of Italians, of Slavs, of Rumanians, of Czechs, and of Slovaks from foreign domination; the enfranchisement of populations subject to the bloody tyranny of the Turks; . . . and the liberation of Europe from the brutal covetousness of Prussian militarism."

Then on January 22, 1917, President Wilson, in an historic address to the Senate, set forth the principles that must form the basis of any peace which would have any prospect of permanency, and which the United States would be ready to join other nations in guaranteeing. Among the principles and the conditions of peace were these: (1) "The principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property."

(2) "That no nation should seek to extend its policy over any other nation or people, but that every people should be left free to determine its own policy, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful."

(3) Limitation of war navies, of armies, and of all naval and military preparations for war; and a league of the civilized nations of the world to guarantee peace and the rights of all nations.[49]

This setting forth by the Allies and President Wilson of what should be the terms and principles of a just and permanent peace

[49] This passage is slightly condensed.

was at the same time a disclosure of the real issues involved in the great war, and thus a revelation of the deeper causes of the unparalleled conflict; for in the terms of settlement of a war, if the settlement be a just, adequate, and final settlement, are disclosed the real causes of the struggle that it brings to a conclusion.[50]

Dwelling upon the suggestion of a league of nations for maintaining the peace of the world, President Wilson said impressively: "It is inconceivable that the people of the United States should play no part in that great enterprise. They cannot, in honor, withhold the service to which they are now about to be challenged. . . . That service is nothing less than this — to add their authority and their power to the authority and force of other nations to guarantee peace and justice throughout the world."

President Wilson at this time apparently believed that the people of the United States would be called upon only to take part, after the war, in the formation of a union or federation of the nations to maintain the future peace of the world and to preserve the liberties of all nations, great and small. But it was a vastly greater and more self-sacrificing service to which they were soon to be challenged.

788. The German Government announces its Purpose to resume Unrestricted Submarine Operations (Jan. 31, 1917). — We have noted the submarine controversy between the United States and Germany (sec. 782). The pledge given the United States by the German government not to torpedo liners without first caring for the safety of crew and passengers was only partially kept for about a year and a half. Then Germany gave notice to the United States that it would immediately "do away with the restrictions which until now it has impressed upon its use of its fighting means at sea." This meant that all ships, those of neutrals as well as those of the enemy, entering designated areas in the Mediterranean or a zone drawn around the British Isles, would be sunk on sight and without regard to the safety of the persons they carried.[51]

[50] Cf. secs. 761 and 762.

[51] Permission was given to the United States to send one passenger liner a week to Great Britain, provided that it was marked in a certain way with stripes, departed on a specified day, and made the port of Falmouth in England its destination.

The answer of the United States government to this amazing announcement was to hand the German ambassador, Bernstorff, his passports.[52] This meant the severance of all diplomatic relations with the Imperial German Government. In an address of great dignity and earnestness President Wilson informed the Congress of the step he had taken. The address was in effect a warning to the German government not to do the thing it had threatened to do.

789. The Russian Revolution (March 16, 1917). — While the United States, on the verge of war, was awaiting events, the attention of the world was arrested by one of the most remarkable revolutions in history. On March 16, 1917, Tsar Nicholas II, the reigning representative of the House of Románov, which had ruled despotically in Russia for over three hundred years, was forced to abdicate, and a provisional government was set up.[53] Amnesty was granted for all political and religious offenses. Tens of thousands of exiles in Siberia and in the prison fortresses of Russia were set free. Liberty of speech and of the press was proclaimed. All restrictions of a social, religious, and racial character were abolished. Universal suffrage was decreed. A constituent assembly was to be called to draft a constitution. The news of the revolution was received by liberals everywhere with unbounded enthusiasm. The United States straightway recognized the new government and welcomed Russia as a member of the family of free nations. The British Premier, David Lloyd George, in a message of congratulation said of the revolution: "It reveals the fundamental truth that this war is at bottom a struggle for popular government and liberty. It shows that through the war the principle of liberty, which is the only sure safeguard of peace in the world, has already won one resounding victory. It is a sure promise that the Prussian military autocracy, which began the war and which is still the only barrier to peace, will before long be overthrown."

[52] Feb. 3, 1917.

[53] The immediate cause of the revolution, aside from the widespread suffering of the people and general war-weariness, was the incompetence shown by the government in the conduct of the war, and the popular belief, which was well founded, that the defeats which the Russian armies had suffered were the result of treachery on the part of Russian officials of pro-German sympathies.

Unfortunately the draught of liberty was too strong. The Russian people, suddenly freed from autocratic tyranny, were intoxicated. They were in a state of bewilderment. Hundreds of German agents crossed the frontier and incited sedition, disorder, and treason. The provisional government made heroic but unavailing efforts to hold back the country from anarchy. The army fell into a state of disorder and confusion. Of this collapse of Russia and her practical elimination as a military factor from the war we shall speak later.

790. The United States enters the War (April 6, 1917).— On the second day of April, 1917, President Wilson addressed both Houses of Congress, called in extraordinary session, on the results of the unrestricted operations of the German submarines resumed two months before.[54] "The new policy," he said, "has swept every restriction aside — vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and sorely stricken people of Belgium . . . have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion or of principle. . . . The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind."

The President then advised the Congress that it "declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the government and people of the United States [and] that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it."

"We are glad," he continued, "to fight for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its people, the German people included; for the rights of nations, great and small, and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy."

The Congress and the country were profoundly moved. Four days later, on the sixth of April, the House of Representatives by an

[54] See sec. 788.

overwhelming vote accepted a joint resolution, which had already been passed by the Senate, and which declared that a state of war existed between the Imperial German Government and the government and the people of the United States. Thus was the momentous decision made, and the great American republic, without excitement but with grave determination and with a good conscience, entered the World War.

To the allied countries the action of the United States was a heartening affirmation of the righteousness of their cause and a sure guarantee of ultimate victory. On receipt of the news in England the Stars and Stripes were flung out alongside the Union Jack of Great Britain from the high tower of the Parliament Building at Westminster — "the first time," it is said, "that a foreign flag was ever displayed from that eminence."

A few weeks later the first troops of an expeditionary force from the United States, under General Pershing, landed in France.[55] They were received by the war-worn French people with frantic demonstrations of joy and gratitude. After marching through the streets of Paris the soldiers made a pilgrimage to Lafayette's grave. Arriving at the tomb, General Pershing saluted and spoke these words: *Lafayette, nous voilà!* ("Lafayette, here we are!")

791. Other Events of the Year 1917. After the decision of the United States government, in early April, to accept the status of a belligerent forced upon it by the acts of the German government, the remaining months of the year 1917 were spent by it in preparations for actual participation in the war. Ten million men between twenty-one and thirty-one years of age were registered, from which by selective draft a great army in successive installments of half a million or more was to be created, equipped, and drilled. Sixteen cantonments, each a veritable city capable of accommodating about forty thousand soldiers, were constructed and made ready for the new recruits by early autumn. To meet the cost of these preparations and the expense of building a great mercantile fleet of hundreds of vessels to replace those destroyed by the German submarines, and of constructing thousands of airships, as

[55] June 26.

well as to provide for great loans to our allies, Congress voted sums of money reckoned by billions. These enormous amounts were raised by increased taxation and by the sale of bonds.

In Europe the summer and fall months of the year witnessed military operations on all the battle fronts. In the west there was practically continuous trench warfare, but the lines of neither side were broken through, and the year ended without any military decision on this front having been reached.

In the east the Russian collapse became complete by midsummer. The army simply fell to pieces. Liberty had been proclaimed, and to the simple peasant soldiers that meant that every one was free to do as he liked. Thousands left the trenches and returned to their homes. The empire disintegrated like the army. Finland, the Ukraine, and other districts or nationalities severed all relations with Petrograd and set up as independent republics.

Taking advantage of the Russian situation, the Germans seized the important Baltic port of Riga.[56] The provisional government established at Petrograd was overthrown, and the reins of power passed into the hands of the extreme socialists (Bolsheviki), who instituted a régime similar in some respects to that of the extremists of the French Revolution. The leaders of this counter-revolution, Lenine and Trotzky, now opened peace negotiations with the Central Powers.[57] The principles they proclaimed were "no annexations, no indemnities, and self-determination of peoples." The year ended with these negotiations still in progress.

The Russian collapse had serious results for the Italians. It allowed the Central Powers to transfer considerable forces from the eastern to the Italian front. A great offensive against the Italians resulted in the breaking of the Italian lines, which necessitated a retreat to the Piave River and the abandonment of all the ground that the Italian armies, under the able General Cadorna, had gained in two years of arduous mountain campaigning. A part of Venetia also was lost by the Italians.[58]

[56] Aug. 3, 1917. [57] In December, at Brest-Litovsk.
[58] October and November, 1917.

In Asian Turkey the British forces made important advances during the year. In the early spring they captured the city of Bagdad, on the Tigris River,[59] and thus gained control of lower Mesopotamia. Towards the end of the year they wrested from the Turks the city of Jerusalem. The Holy City was thus restored to the Christian world after having been in the hands of the Moslems since its capture by the Saracens in the year 637, excepting the short period in the twelfth century when it was held by the crusaders.

On the sea the German ruthless warfare against the merchant ships of the world was the matter of chief importance. Hundreds of ships of the Allies and of neutrals alike were sunk and thousands of lives of non-combatants destroyed. But this lawless method of warfare resulted in much greater injury to Germany than to her foes. It turned virtually the whole civilized world against her.

Towards the close of the year Brazil declared war against Germany, making the nineteenth in the list of states taking such action.[60] Eleven others had, by the end of the year, broken off relations with her.[61] These thirty states embrace more than four fifths of the world's population.

792. Events of the Year 1918. — Before entering into the peace conference with Russia, mentioned in the preceding section, Germany had agreed to adhere to the general principles of "no annexations, no indemnities, and the self-determination of peoples." These principles she wholly disregarded as soon

[59] March 11, 1917. An earlier attempt to take the city had ended in failure and the capture of the entire British army of 10,000 men at Kut-el-Amara (April 28, 1916).

[60] The names of these states and the date of the entry of each into the war are here given: Serbia, July 28, 1914; Russia, Aug. 1, 1914; France, Aug. 3, 1914; Belgium, Aug. 4, 1914; Great Britain, Aug. 4, 1914; Montenegro, Aug. 7, 1914; Japan, Aug. 23, 1914; Italy, May 23, 1915; San Marino, June 2, 1915; Portugal, March 10, 1916; Rumania, Aug. 27, 1916; United States, April 6, 1917; Cuba, April 8, 1917; Panama, April 9, 1917; Greece, July 16, 1917; Siam, July 22, 1917; Liberia, Aug. 7, 1917; China, Aug. 14, 1917; Brazil, Oct. 26, 1917.

[61] Bolivia broke off relations April 14, 1917; Guatemala, April 27, 1917; Honduras, May 18, 1917; Nicaragua, May 19, 1917; Santo Domingo, June 8, 1917; Haiti, June 17, 1917; Chile, June 29, 1917; Costa Rica, Sept. 21, 1917; Peru, Oct. 6, 1917; Uruguay, Oct. 7, 1917; Ecuador, Dec. 8, 1917.

as Russia was in her power. The states which came into existence through the break-up of the Russian Empire — Ukrania, Poland, Lithuania, and Finland — were treated as dependent and vassal states of the Central Powers.

With the pressure on the eastern front removed by the collapse of Russia, the German government, in flagrant violation of its plighted word, straightway transferred large bodies of troops from Russia to the western front, in the hope of gaining a military decision there before the United States could come with effective force to the help of her allies. With their armies in France thus strengthened, the Germans, late in March, launched their long-expected drive for Paris and the Channel ports. At the same time they began the bombardment of Paris with a monstrous long-range cannon, which was located seventy-five miles from the capital. A few days later a bomb from the huge gun fell upon a Paris church, where a large congregation was gathered at a Good Friday service, killing seventy-five persons and wounding ninety others. Under the terrific onset of the German armies, numbering probably over one million, the Franco-British lines were bent back with heavy losses, but were not broken. The situation was most critical. All the American soldiers in France, under General Pershing, were offered to Marshal Foch, the commander-in-chief of the Allies, to be used as he should deem best. At the same time urgent appeal was made to the United States government to hurry to France all the reënforcements possible. In response to this call the shipping of troops across the sea was hastened. A steady flow of about a quarter of a million men each month was maintained until the close of the war, when the United States had in France a great army of over two millions.

Throughout the spring and early summer months the Germans renewed their offensive at intervals and made further gains. But by the middle of July the drive had spent its force. The American army had by this time been so greatly augmented that the superiority in numbers was now on the side of the Allies. The tide of battle turned. A great counter-offensive was launched. The

Germans were hurled back across the Marne. The so-called Hindenburg line, a system of strong defenses, was broken, and the German armies began a general retreat from France towards the Belgian frontier.

With the tide of battle on the western front thus running against the Germans, disaster was befalling their allies on other fronts. In Palestine the British forces under General Allenby, on the historic field of Armageddon, almost annihilated the Ottoman armies. The important cities of Damascus and Beirut fell into the hands of the British (October 2–9). At about the same time, on the Macedonian front, the Franco-Serbian forces inflicted upon the Bulgarian armies a defeat which, before the end of September, forced Bulgaria to sue for peace. This was granted on terms which meant a complete military surrender.

The withdrawal of Bulgaria from the war, along with the reverses in Syria and the critical situation on the western front, caused Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey simultaneously to ask through President Wilson for a general armistice "on land and water and in the air" (October 5). The armistice was to be the forerunner of peace negotiations based on fourteen propositions which President Wilson had formulated and explained in various addresses (see sec. 787).

After an exchange of notes between President Wilson and the Central Powers, the matter was given over into the hands of the Supreme War Council of the Allies in France. Events now moved rapidly. Before the end of the month Turkey, hopelessly defeated, signed an armistice which amounted to unconditional surrender (October 30), and four days later Austria-Hungary, with her armies in Italy routed and the monarchy rapidly dissolving into its various racial elements, sought and obtained an armistice on like conditions. At the same time the terms on which Germany might be granted a cessation of hostilities were formulated by the War Council of the Allies at Versailles, and the German government was informed that Marshal Foch would receive accredited representatives and communicate to them the conditions of an armistice. On Friday, November 8, a German

delegation reached the headquarters of Marshal Foch and were handed the armistice terms for acceptance or rejection by eleven o'clock on the following Monday. A few hours before the expiration of the time limit, the armistice, which was to run for thirty-six days, was signed by the German envoys. Among its thirty-four conditions were these: (1) immediate evacuation by the German armies, without harm to persons or destruction of property, of all invaded countries, and withdrawal across the Rhine to a line about six miles from the right, or east, bank of that river; (2) the surrender of all submarines and certain other ships of the German navy; (3) renunciation of the treaties of Bucharest and Brest-Litovsk; and (4) the immediate repatriation of allied prisoners and deported civilians, the restitution of property wrongfully taken from invaded countries, and reparation for damage done.

These conditions were in effect equal to full and unconditional surrender, and were such as to make it impossible for Germany, at the expiration of the truce period, to renew hostilities. Hence the signing of the armistice may be regarded as marking the end of the great war. The Allied armies, with Marshal Foch as Generalissimo of all the forces, had inflicted the most comprehensive and thorough defeat in history, and amid universal rejoicing and celebration had brought to an end the greatest and most horrible war in the history of the world.

Shortly before the signing of the armistice Emperor William, his mad dream of world dominion shattered, sought an asylum in Holland, leaving Germany not the dictator of a Germanized world, as he had fondly hoped, but the scene of turmoil, revolution, and threatened anarchy.

References. — ROLAND G. USHER, *Pan-Germanism*. ANDRÉ CHÉRADAME, *The Pan-German Plot Unmasked*. FRIEDRICH VON BERNHARDI, *Germany and the Next War*. MORRIS JASTROW, *The War and the Bagdad Railway*. PRINCE VON BÜLOW, *Imperial Germany*. JAMES W. GERARD, *My Four Years in Germany*. HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS, *The New Map of Europe*. JAMES M. BECK, *The Evidence in the Case*. JACQUES MARQUIS DE DAMPIERRE, *German Imperialism and International Law*. ELLERY C. STOWELL, *The Diplomacy of the War of 1914*. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, *A Survey of International Relations between the United States and Germany, 1914–1917*. HENRY VAN DYKE, *Fighting for Peace*. D. THOMAS CURTIN, *The Land of Deepening Shadow*. CARL W. ACKERMAN, *Germany, the Next Republic*. The two following works are published anonymously: *Out of Their Own Mouths* (utterances of German rulers, statesmen, and party leaders) and *I Accuse!* (J'Accuse!), by a German. Catalogue numbers 1, 4, 5, 6 of Series No. 1 of the War Information Booklets, issued by the Committee on Public Information, Washington, D.C. The text of the different documents (the "British White Paper," the "German White Book," the "French Yellow Book," etc.) of the belligerent governments bearing on the outbreak of the war will be found in convenient form in the pamphlets issued by the American Association for International Conciliation, 407 West 117th St., New York City.

W 82

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS